

adopted. Had I been here, I would have been one of its cosponsors at that time.

I am sure that the Austrian people themselves have not forgotten that not too many years ago, great numbers of Austrians themselves were homeless and adrift. I pray that the people of Austria will heed this expression by the Senate which bespeaks the concern of the American people and indicate in clear terms that their country is not to be swayed by minor league terrorism from an established humanitarian and responsible policy of facilitating the transit of refugees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article in connection with this matter which was published in today's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 2, 1973]

EXIT THROUGH AUSTRIA

The most immediately urgent point now, in the negotiations between Israel and the Austrian Government over the emigration process for Soviet Jews, is to insure that the line of exodus through Austria remains open. This is the prime issue to be resolved when Chancellor Kreisky and Premier Golda Meir confer in Vienna today.

The Austrian leader made a fundamental mistake, we believe, in acceding to the blackmail demands of Arab terrorists and in closing down the Schönau transit center through which Israeli representatives have been processing the flow of immigrants from the Soviet Union in the past two years. Such a concession to terror tactics can only encourage fanatic extremists of the Palestinian or any other cause. Success in terrorism inevitably breeds more desire for more success by the same devices, as governments and travelers around the world have learned.

Dr. Kreisky has, however, been firm since last week's terrorist raid in pledging that Austria will continue to facilitate the flow of Soviet Jews. It is significant that he chose a meeting with official Soviet visitors last Saturday to make the formal statement that "Austria is open to everyone who wishes to reach another country via Austria; Austria remains a country which offers asylum to everyone who feels persecuted."

This assurance, rather than his dubious judgments or subsequent ill-conceived remarks under the heat of international pressures, is the most important point for Israel to build upon now.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1973

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 2335) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Paul Summit, of my staff, have the privilege of the floor during the consideration of the amendment I am about to offer, and during the vote thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 9, line 11, immediately before the quotation marks, insert the following: "This section shall not apply with respect to assistance rendered under section 515(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, or with respect to any authority of the Drug Enforcement Administration or the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator HRUSKA, I offer an amendment to the pending bill which is designed to meet a potential problem regarding section 115.

Section 115 of S. 2335 provides as follows:

No part of any appropriation made available to carry out this or any other provision of law shall be used to conduct any police training or related program for a foreign country.

We have been advised by Senator FULBRIGHT that the basic objective of this provision is to eliminate the training program currently administered by the Department of State's Agency for International Development, Office of Public Safety.

Mr. President, on August 6, 1973, the President signed into law the "Crime Control Act of 1973"—Public Law 93-83—which continues the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration's authority to provide financial and technical assistance to improve methods of law enforcement and crime control. For the first time, LEAA was granted the authority in section 515(c) of the act to provide technical assistance concerning law enforcement problems outside the United States as follows:

To cooperate with and render technical assistance to States, units of general local government, combinations of such States or units, or other public or private agencies, organizations, institutions, or international agencies in matters relating to law enforcement and criminal justice.

The conference report, Senate Report No. 93-349 at 31, explained the scope of and limitations on this authority:

The conference substitute also accepts the Senate version which adds authority to provide technical assistance to international law enforcement agencies as well as national law enforcement agencies. In recognition of the international scope of many law enforcement and criminal justice problems the conferees agreed to give LEAA authority to provide technical assistance in such areas as narcotics interdiction, skyjacking, and terrorism. The conferees felt that LEAA's international operations should be limited to providing technical assistance in cases of this character.

That is a quotation from the report and shows what the intent of the law is.

Section 115 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as contained in S. 2335—the Foreign Assistance Act of 1973—presently under consideration, imposes a broad prohibition on the use of funds under any provision of law "to conduct any police training or related program for a foreign country." Although I wholeheartedly agree with the objective of this provision to prohibit intrusion of the United States into the domestic law enforcement situation in foreign countries, the language is susceptible to a possible construction that would eliminate the new very limited authority of the Law Enforcement Assist-

ance Administration to contribute to solutions of international enforcement problems in the areas of narcotics interdiction, skyjacking, and terrorism.

Mr. President, similar problems arise with respect to the Drug Enforcement Administration. In attempting to carry out its responsibility to suppress the ever-increasing worldwide traffic in narcotics and marihuana, the DEA, formerly the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, last year requested and was granted appropriations to assist in the training of foreign police officers in anti-drug trafficking measures. This international training program is designed to increase the capability of these foreign drug law enforcement officers to assist the United States in its attempt to intercept the flow of these drugs before they ever get to this country. Because of the very nature of the drug problem and its international scope, this type of international cooperation is absolutely essential if we are to put an end to this most insidious crime. Indeed, since the training program has been instituted, drug seizures in these foreign countries have greatly increased. As presently worded, however, section 115 would also put an end to this very beneficial and necessary program, a result which I am confident was unintended.

Mr. President, we have also learned that the Federal Bureau of Investigation conducts certain training programs involving foreign law enforcement personnel. For instance, the Bureau participates in programs with our neighboring country of Canada for exchange of information and mutual training on border control problems. In addition, a small number of police officers from foreign countries—some 42 officers in fiscal year 1973—are accepted for training in the FBI National Academy each year.

In order to obviate an unintended disruption of Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Federal Bureau of Investigation programs in these areas, I respectfully present, with the Senator from Nebraska, for consideration an amendment to section 115 of S. 2335 as follows:

This section shall not apply with respect to assistance rendered under section 515(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, or with respect to any authority of the Drug Enforcement Administration or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. President, in my view, this amendment would permit limited legitimate cooperation in international law enforcement without encroaching upon the laudable objectives underlying section 115 of the Foreign Assistance Act.

I do not think there can be any objection to these limited activities if we are to carry on our vital cooperation and assistance in support of effective international efforts to control serious crimes across international borders, such as narcotics traffic, terrorism, and skyjacking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record three statements concerning foreign law enforcement assistance activities of the Law Enforcement Assistance Adminis-

October 2, 1973

tration, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

The new authority of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to provide technical assistance concerning law enforcement problems outside the United States is limited in very strict ways.

First, it is limited to law enforcement problems of an international nature—those which affect a number of countries and which cross national borders.

Second, it is limited to the dissemination of information on how to control international law enforcement problems.

Third, it would not involve training of law enforcement or other criminal justice personnel for enforcement of laws or other programs inside a nation which are domestic in nature.

Fourth, it would not be a major part of the operations of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, but rather would involve dissemination of information which is a by-product of other LEAA activities.

The Conference Report on Section 515(c) of the Crime Control Act of 1973 says: "In recognition of the international scope of many law enforcement and criminal justice problems the conferees agreed to give LEAA authority to provide technical assistance in such areas as narcotics interdiction, skyjacking, and terrorism. The conferees felt that LEAA's international operations should be limited to providing technical assistance in cases of this character."

And in his remarks on the floor, Senator Hruska said: "... the conferees recognized the international scope of many law enforcement and criminal justice problems. Thus, we intended to give LEAA authority to provide technical assistance abroad in traditional police areas of international concern such as narcotics interdiction, skyjacking and terrorism."

The range of crimes to be included under the technical assistance program are among the worst crimes—for they generally involve violence against people rather than being offenses against property.

In a report to the Congress last year on government-wide law enforcement activities, the Attorney General said there had been 27 aircraft hijackings in 1971—and 18 of them had been successful. That is the statistic for only the United States. Virtually every nation is faced with this threat—and even when hijackings occur overseas they frequently involve American passengers. Hijackings have led to deaths, injuries, and the spread of terror—to say nothing of throwing up obstacles to the harmonious way of sovereign nations doing business among themselves. Hijacking is a problem that no nation can solve by itself. It can only be solved by international cooperation—and the technical assistance to be offered by LEAA would heighten that cooperation.

Terrorism is another obstacle in the path of intercourse among nations. Like hijacking, it cannot be solved by any one nation alone. And like hijacking, it can affect all nations, for no country can consider itself immune when terrorists operate with impunity. It can take many forms: kidnapping of citizens or diplomats; murders at the Olympic Games; bombings which kill innocent people; explosive devices sent through the mails, as happened at the British Embassy in Washington recently.

The United States seems particularly vulnerable to another crime problem which exists on an international scale—the use of narcotics. No heroin is produced in the

United States. It all comes to this country from abroad. Enforcement measures in the United States cannot by themselves stem the flow or use of heroin. These goals can be achieved only by a double effort—effective enforcement in this country plus meaningful, cooperative efforts with foreign countries to either thwart the production or impede the flow of heroin. Much of the crime in the United States—the worst crime, the crimes of violence—are caused by heroin addicts. And thousands of lives are either destroyed or twisted—those of the addicts themselves.

There will be no LEAA technical assistance for problems which are local in nature—no assistance to local police departments for problems which are domestic in nature, no assistance to improve court programs to solve local problems, no assistance to correctional agencies to improve local corrections problems. Assistance will be offered only for law enforcement problems which transcend national borders.

A number of cooperative efforts with other nations already being carried out by the United States in the area of international crime. In the narcotics field, for instance, the Attorney General last year reported to the Congress that Federal drug agents were located in 44 cities in 31 foreign countries—working with these foreign countries to solve mutual problems.

LEAA would disseminate information to foreign nations and international organizations on new and more effective ways to combat crimes which have become worldwide problems. This information would be a spin-off from other LEAA-sponsored activities—particularly material developed by its research office, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice. The Institute already is engaged in research in such areas as developing sensors which sniff out both heroin and explosives, devices which detect hidden firearms, and new techniques which would enable law enforcement personnel to prevent a wide variety of crimes.

Though important benefits would result from technical assistance to reduce international crime problems, this program would constitute a small part of the over-all LEAA program. The technical assistance material to be disseminated could be information already developed for the law enforcement and criminal justice community in the United States.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Drug Enforcement Administration is particularly concerned with Section 115, because it threatens the training program to foreign police officers directly related to drug traffic prevention functions. In Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968, 33 F.R. 6965, 82 Stat. 1369, one of the specific functions given to the newly created Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (now the Drug Enforcement Administration) was to maintain worldwide operations, working closely with other nations, to suppress the trade in illicit narcotics and marijuana. This was highlighted in President Nixon's Message on Drug Abuse to the Congress on June 17, 1971, where he stated:

"I am requesting one million dollars to be used by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for training of foreign narcotics enforcement personnel. Additional personnel within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs would permit the strengthening of the investigative capacities of BNDD offices in the U.S., as well as their ability to assist host governments in the hiring, training, and deployment of personnel and the employment of necessary equipment for drug abuse control."

To carry out this responsibility the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (now DEA) asked for, and Congress authorized, appropriations to assist in the training of

foreign police officers in anti-drug trafficking measures. For example, in its Budget Estimate for FY 1973, on page 40, it is stated "The Bureau has increased its role in the training of United Nations Fellowships for periods ranging from two to six weeks, and by promoting specialized training to other nations." In its Budget Estimate for FY 1973, on page 50 it is stated "In 1972, BNDD accelerated its efforts in the training of foreign law enforcement personnel. Schools were conducted in the Panama Canal Zone; Saigon, Vietnam; Panama City, Panama; Dublin, Ireland; Mexico City, Mexico; Rome, Italy; Santiago, Chile; Lima, Peru; Singapore Republic; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Vienna, Austria; and Manila, P.I." A special school for Turkish officers and an International Seminar on Illicit Drug Traffic and Abuse were held in Washington. Fifteen European and North American nations and two international organizations participated."

From 1968 through 1973, over 4,000 foreign police officers from more than 40 countries will have received training by the Drug Enforcement Administration or its predecessor, BNDD. On several occasions, the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs has taken special note of this function, and the United States representatives have continued to encourage member nations to take advantage of this program. The international training program is designed to increase the capability of foreign drug law enforcement officers to interdict the flow of drugs before they enter the United States. The United States has repeatedly requested countries to increase their efforts to stop the trafficking in illicit drugs; it has offered to help train foreign personnel to develop administrative and enforcement capabilities, and elimination or even diminution of the training program would be seen as a lack of good faith and threaten the progress we have made.

Through these training programs, close working relations have been developed between DEA agents and their counterparts in foreign countries. This has produced excellent results. Seizures of illicit drugs in foreign countries have risen significantly as our training programs and cooperation have increased. Enactment of Section 115 prohibiting DEA from conducting any police training for a foreign country would seriously hamper United States programs aimed at stopping the international drug traffic and could prove to be detrimental in our efforts to stem the tide of drug abuse.

Therefore, the Drug Enforcement Administration strongly opposes enactment of Section 115.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Section 115 of S. 2335 appears so broadly worded that it would probably prohibit the FBI from accepting qualified law enforcement personnel from foreign countries for training in the FBI National Academy and undoubtedly would preclude the FBI from cooperating with Canadian law enforcement agencies located near the U.S.-Canadian border in training matters.

The FBI National Academy is operated under provisions of Section 404 of Public Law 90-351 dated 9-19-68. At the specific request of the President the FBI began a number of years ago to accept a limited number of foreign law enforcement officers in each session of the Academy. Generally, no more than 10 or 11 are accepted for each session. The idea behind this cooperative venture was to assist in upgrading law enforcement in under developed countries. Some of the foreign students are recommended by the Agency for International Development (AID) of the Department of State. Applicants are also accepted by the FBI on direct applications from the head of the foreign police agency. Final selection of applicants is made by the FBI. AID participation

October 2, 1973

S 18405

extends only to recommending a country from which applicants should come. The FBI makes the candidate selections.

In fiscal year 1973, 42 officers from foreign countries were trained at the FBI National Academy. The FBI does not provide grants to its Academy students; however, no student is required to pay tuition or for room, board, supplies, and laundry costs during the 12-week period. Travel expenses for foreign students have been paid either by AID or by the students' own agency. Travel funds are the only funds from AID.

Countries represented in the training sessions in fiscal year 1973 were: Canada, Australia, Malaysia, Thailand, Iran, Lebanon, Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Cyprus, Korea, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Sweden, Norway, Philippines, and the Bahamas.

The cooperative training program with Canadian law enforcement agencies located along the border is not separately funded. The only expense incurred involves the time and travel costs of FBI instructors. In fiscal year 1973, FBI personnel participated in 6 training schools in Canada attended by 297 officers and involving 38 hours of instruction by FBI personnel. This segment is the most important to the FBI because it involves mutual problems faced by both the United States and Canada.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I support Senator McCLELLAN's amendment to the pending bill. It is designed to meet a potential problem regarding section 115.

Section 115 of S. 2335 provides as follows:

No part of any appropriation made available to carry out this or any other provision of law shall be used to conduct any police training or related program for a foreign country.

We have been advised that the basic objective of this provision is to eliminate the training program currently administered by the Department of State's Agency for International Development, Office of Public Safety.

Unfortunately, the words "or any other provision of law" in section 115 of S. 2335 would seem to prohibit the funding of very important police training programs presently being conducted or planned by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the new Drug Enforcement Administration.

LEAA is concerned that section 115 may substantially limit the use of LEAA's new authority contained in section 515 (c) of Public Law 93-83, signed by the President on August 6, 1973. This new authority would allow LEAA:

To cooperate with and render technical assistance to States, units of general local government, combinations of such States, or units, or other public or private agencies, organizations, institutions, or international agencies in matters relating to law enforcement and criminal justice.

The conference report, Senate Report No. 93-349 at page 31, explained the scope and limitations of this authority as follows:

The conference substitute also accepts the Senate version which adds authority to provide technical assistance to international law enforcement agencies as well as national law enforcement agencies. In recognition of the international scope of many law enforcement and criminal justice problems the

conferes agreed to give LEAA authority to provide technical assistance in such areas as narcotics interdiction, skyjacking, and terrorism. The conferes felt that LEAA's international operations should be limited to providing technical assistance in cases of this character.

LEAA believes that problems such as hijacking and terrorism, both of which cannot be solved by one nation alone, would be important subjects for technical assistance.

Another such problem which exists on an international scale is that of illegal narcotic trade. We are all aware that the goal of significant drug interdiction can only be achieved with meaningful international cooperation. LEAA would be able to translate the knowledge and expertise developed in this country into useful suggestions for better narcotics control worldwide.

LEAA intends that its function under this new authority would be limited to the dissemination of information on how to control these problems of international scope. It is not anticipated that LEAA would become involved in training law enforcement or other criminal justice personnel for enforcement of domestic laws or other programs within another nation. Furthermore, such international assistance would not be a major part of LEAA operations, but would involve only the dissemination of information which is a byproduct of other LEAA activities.

Concerning the FBI, section 115 of S. 2335 may prohibit the Bureau from accepting qualified law enforcement personnel from friendly foreign countries into the FBI National Academy, and would prevent the Bureau from offering training assistance, when requested, to Canadian police agencies located near the United States-Canadian border.

Authority to conduct the FBI National Academy for domestic law enforcement officers is contained in section 404 of Public Law 90-351, dated June 19, 1968. For a number of years, the FBI has accepted a limited number of foreign law enforcement officers in each session of the FBI National Academy, usually no more than 10 or 11. This policy was instituted upon the specific request of the President as a part of this country's program to assist in upgrading the caliber of law enforcement in underdeveloped countries.

Most of the foreign students are sponsored by the Agency for International Development (AID), Department of State; however, in some instances applications have been accepted directly from the head of a foreign police agency not covered by the AID program. During fiscal year 1973, a total of 42 officers, representing Canada, Australia, Malaysia, Thailand, Iran, Lebanon, Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Cyprus, Korea, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Sweden, Norway, Philippines, and the Bahamas, were enrolled in the FBI National Academy. No financial grant is made by the FBI to any National Academy student, foreign or domestic, but no National Academy student is required to pay tuition, room, board, laundry, and dry cleaning costs, or for supplies required in connection with the

12 weeks of training. Travel expenses for foreign students are paid either by the student's agency or by AID, is sponsored by that agency.

The FBI also has followed the policy of affording limited training assistance, when requested, to Canadian law enforcement agencies located near the United States-Canadian border. There is no funding involved in this assistance; the only expenses are the time of FBI instructors and their travel costs. During fiscal year 1973, FBI instructors participated in six training schools in Canada, attended by 297 officers and involving 38 hours of instruction by FBI personnel.

Additionally, the FBI has mentioned that the broad language of section 115 of S. 2335 may possibly prohibit FBI cooperation with foreign police agencies in other modest training matters.

The Drug Enforcement Administration is concerned with section 115, because it appears to threaten the training program to foreign police officers directly related to drug traffic prevention functions. In Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1968, 33 F.R. 6965, 82 statute 1369, one of the specific functions given to the newly created Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—now the Drug Enforcement Administration—was to maintain worldwide operations, working closely with other nations, to suppress the trade in illicit narcotics and marihuana. This was highlighted in President Nixon's message on Drug Abuse to the Congress on July 17, 1971, where he states:

I am requesting one million dollars to be used by the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for training of foreign narcotics enforcement personnel. Additional personnel within the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs would permit the strengthening of the investigative capacities of BNDD offices in the U.S., as well as their ability to assist host governments in the hiring, training, and deployment of personnel and the employment of necessary equipment for drug abuse control.

To carry out this responsibility the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—now DEA—asked for, and Congress authorized, appropriations to assist in the training of foreign police officers in anti-drug trafficking measures. For example, in its budget estimate for fiscal year 1973, on page 40, it is stated—

The Bureau has increased its role in the training of United Nations Fellowships for periods ranging from 2 to 6 weeks, and by promoting specialized training to other nations.

In its budget estimate for fiscal year 1973, on page 50 it is stated—

In 1972, BNDD accelerated its efforts in the training of foreign law enforcement personnel. Schools were conducted in the Panama Canal Zone; Saigon, Vietnam; Panama City, Panama; Dublin, Ireland; Mexico City, Mexico, Rome, Italy; Santiago, Chile; Lima, Peru; Singapore Republic; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Vienna, Austria; and Manila, P.I. A special school for Turkish officers and an International Seminar on Illicit Drug Traffic and Abuse were held in Washington. Fifteen European and North American nations and two international organizations participated.

From 1969 through 1973, over 4,000 foreign police officers from more than 40

countries will have received training by the Drug Enforcement Administration or its predecessor, BNDD. On several occasions, the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs has taken special note of this function, and the United States representatives have continued to encourage member nations to take advantage of this program. The international training program is designed to increase the capability of foreign drug law enforcement officers to interdict the flow of drugs before they enter the United States. The United States has repeatedly requested countries to increase their efforts to stop the trafficking in illicit drugs; it has offered to help train foreign personnel to develop administrative and enforcement capabilities, and elimination or even diminution of the training program would be seen as a lack of good faith and threaten the progress we have made.

Through these training programs, close working relations have been developed between DEA agents and their counterparts in foreign countries. This has produced excellent results. Seizures of illicit drugs in foreign countries have risen significantly as our training programs and cooperation have increased. The concern is that enactment of section 115 may seriously hamper DEA programs aimed at stopping international drug traffic.

We understand that the House-passed bill which parallels S. 2335 did not contain a provision such as section 115 in S. 2335, and, therefore, if S. 2335 passes in the Senate, this entire matter will be open for consideration in conference.

We, therefore, seek an amendment to S. 2335 to except the authorized Department of Justice efforts which I have outlined in order to insure protection of both ongoing and prospective police training programs conducted by the Department of Justice for foreign countries.

I trust that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Mr. Fulbright) will see the merit in our views and recognize that it is not at all disruptive of his concern and the concern of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey).

We feel that these programs are important. There is no intention for the programs covered by Senator McClellan's amendment to come within the sphere of activities prohibited by section 115 of S. 2335 as drawn. Therefore, it is my hope that the amendment will be agreed to in the form offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, could I ask a clarifying question of the sponsors of the amendment? In the programs that the two Senators are sponsoring, there is the program they wish to exempt. Does this involve a situation of sending abroad American personnel to advise or train a foreign police force?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No. This is solely confined to these particular crimes we have identified and which deal with such international problem as drugs, skyjack-

ing, terrorism, and serious crimes across international borders.

Most of the international activities of these Federal agencies would involve technical assistance and exchange of information on law enforcement matters vital to crime control in this country. Additionally, the FBI individually selects a small number of law enforcement personnel from various foreign countries to receive training at the National FBI Academy. This program has the objective of improving the caliber of individual law enforcement officials and is not designed to train a foreign police force to influence domestic law enforcement policies.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield, I would like to subscribe to the answers given by the Senator from Arkansas. My statement and the statement of the Senator from Arkansas specifically describe the scope and training that is given the people abroad. As I previously indicated they do not fall within the area of activities that section 115 of S. 2335 seeks to cover.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no intention to authorize a program to train a foreign police force for their internal purposes. The primary areas covered by my amendment are those where we have a direct interest in protecting our own safety in our own country.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have a question related to that, if I might ask it in behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Humphrey), the manager of the bill.

I put this question in his behalf. He states that he has some concern that the AID public safety program which the committee amendment would abolish may be transferred en bloc to the Justice Department or some agency other than AID. Is that authority sought to be exempted by this amendment? Can the sponsors of this amendment assure the Senate that that is not the intent?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I can assure the Senate that there is no intent to authorize the transfer of the AID public safety program to the Department of Justice or any other agency.

It simply excludes activities presently authorized for LEAA, DEA, and the FBI from the provisions in the bill. It says that this section shall not be applicable to certain specific things. It transfers nothing.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am sorry that I missed the first part of the Senator's explanation. What does it exempt?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am glad to yield whatever time is necessary.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, what does it specifically exempt from section 115?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the amendment says:

This section shall not apply with respect to assistance rendered under section 515(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended, or with respect to any authority of the Drug Enforcement Ad-

ministration or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, is the LEAA involved in providing money to foreign governments?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No. LEAA, DEA, and the FBI are involved in helping to curtail serious law enforcement problems that are international in nature, such as illegal drug traffic, and reduce the effect which these problems have upon this country. That is the purpose for which we seek an exemption for these particular agencies from section 115.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, with section 115 in the bill, what effect does that have on LEAA? I was not aware of that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The section in the bill?

Mr. ABOUREZK. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Section 115 of the bill reads as follows:

PROHIBITING POLICE TRAINING.—No part of any appropriation made available to carry out this or any other provision of law shall be used to conduct any police training or related program for a foreign country.

That "related program" is the thing that prevents the LEAA from cooperating with and furnishing technical assistance to international agencies in trying to stem, for example, the drug traffic into and from this country. If we take it this far, we simply preclude this Government from being able to give and obtain international cooperation and assistance in the drug traffic problem.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Yes. That explains it to me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. ABOUREZK. If the Senator will yield for another question, did the Senator talk about FBI training?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. We have a program with our neighbor, Canada. We send instructors up to Canadian schools to train primarily with respect to our border protection.

Mr. ABOUREZK. And that only goes for Canada, that FBI training?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, as far as I know.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Is there any intention on the part of the authors of the amendment to provide for Justice Department training or FBI training to any of the governments that receive money under the Foreign Aid Act?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No, that is not the case. Let me read a memorandum from the FBI so that there will be no misunderstanding about it. I have put it into the Record, but it reads as follows:

Section 115 of S. 2335 appears so broadly worded that it would probably prohibit the FBI from accepting qualified law enforcement personnel from foreign countries for training in the FBI National Academy and undoubtedly would preclude the FBI from cooperating with Canadian law enforcement agencies located near the U.S.-Canadian border in training matters.

The FBI National Academy is operated under provisions of Section 404 of Public Law 90-351 dated 9-19-68. At the specific request of the President the FBI began a number of years ago to accept a limited number of foreign law enforcement officers in each ses-

sion of the Academy. Generally, no more than 10 or 11 are accepted for each session. The idea behind this cooperative venture was to assist in upgrading law enforcement in underdeveloped countries. Some of the foreign students are recommended by the Agency for International Development (AID) of the Department of State. Applicants are also accepted by the FBI on direct applications from the head of the foreign police agency. Final selection of applicants is made by the FBI.

In fiscal year 1973, 42 officers from foreign countries were trained at the FBI National Academy. The FBI does not provide grants to its Academy students; however, no student is required to pay tuition or for room, board, supplies, and laundry costs during the 12-week period. Travel expenses for foreign students have been paid either by AID or by the students' own agency. Travel funds are the only funds from AID.

Here are the countries that have had students here at the FBI Academy:

Countries represented in the training sessions in fiscal year 1973 were: Canada, Australia, Malaysia, Thailand, Iran, Lebanon, Singapore, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Cyprus, Indonesia, Liberia, Mexico, Sweden, Norway, Philippines, and the Bahamas.

This is a program that has been going on for years.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Let me ask my colleague—

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think this measure as written would stop that program unless the amendment is accepted. It would stop it, if that is what the Senate wishes to do.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I wonder if my colleague from Arkansas might be able to assure the Senate that it is not the intention of the author of the amendment to carry on the police training that has been carried on by AID under the previous provision.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Absolutely not. All we are trying to do here is to permit these three Federal agencies to continue several beneficial programs in this field. The language in the present bill, in my judgment, is broad enough to prohibit all of that. I do not think that was the intention of section 115.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, might I inject at that point that we had that assurance from the sponsors of the amendment, I think perhaps before the Senator from South Dakota came to the floor, and it was in strong, unadulterated language.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is not the intention. We are only trying to preserve what we are doing here that is absolutely essential and has nothing to do with what I understood was the prime objective of this provision. But the provision as written is so broad it goes farther than the author of the provision intended. Unless we do this, we are handicapping ourselves.

Mr. ABOUREZK. As I was the author of this particular section, I submitted it to the Committee on Foreign Relations and they did put it in the bill during their committee sessions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I did not know that the distinguished Senator was the author.

Mr. ABOUREZK. No; I just wanted to say that was the reason for my concern, that an amendment such as this does not abrogate that particular section.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think we have been ample in making certain the intent.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 5 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. I promised to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the colloquy between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from South Dakota has been very interesting and I believe necessary. I am glad the scope of these training activities has been so well covered.

The Senate and the House of Representatives have considered this subject in their conference report on the LEAA bill this year. I read this very pertinent passage from Senate Report No. 93-349:

In recognition of the international scope of many law enforcement and criminal justice problems the conferees agreed to give LEAA authority to provide technical assistance in such areas as narcotics interdiction, skyjacking, and terrorism. The conferees felt that LEAA's international operations should be limited to providing technical assistance in cases of this character.

The problems mentioned in this passage are suggestive of the particular activities in which LEAA desires to become involved. As indicated, the thrust of LEAA efforts in such problems will be in the area of technical assistance and related matters.

The Drug Enforcement Administration and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have similar limitations upon programs involving foreign countries. This Senator is satisfied that all three agencies will properly conduct their activities so that these limited objectives are met. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas has a purpose consistent with these objectives.

Mr. McGEE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his clarification. Does the Senator from New York wish to speak?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in order to give us more time, I have sent an amendment to the amendment to the desk. The purpose is only to give us more time, because I do think this is a serious matter, and widely advertised, and it should be fairly discussed. So I will await my turn, or take the time now, whatever the Senator wishes, and proceed to a vote, that the Senator from New York should proceed, then, under the time won by the introduction of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). Does the Senator yield back his time?

Mr. McGEE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In that case, the Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The second assistant legislative clerk read the amendment:

Strike the period and add: "which relates to crimes of the nature which are unlawful under the laws of the United States."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this raises the question, in this amendment:

To strike the period and add: which relates to crimes of the nature which are unlawful under the laws of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I am for this amendment, if confined to what the authors have in mind. In order to make that clear and get action on it, we must understand what the author of section 15 had in mind. I realize he was here, a short time ago, but let me be his lawyer for a minute. What he had in mind, as I understand it, and I was ardent for it in the committee, was the kind of involvement which we ran into in Brazil and elsewhere, where we had to give aid to police forces and where it was charged there as police persecution and torture, and so forth, and that there could be a colorable link between the aid we gave and what all these policemen may have known or learned about the despicable methods which are antihuman as well as antilegal in the United States.

So I think that what we are all trying to do, I might say to my colleagues—and I am with them—I want to be sure that we understand each other, to be sure that, under any guise, that link should not be established. That is what the purpose of this is about. Because it was such a horrendous thing that we all faced, this was made blanket in its application.

I agree that the two sentences involved are broader than they really needed to be.

Now a question. Are we doing both jobs which we all have in mind to do if we put a limitation on it, because section 515, which the assistant to Senator HRUSKA was kind enough to show me, dealing with technical assistance in relation to the enforcement of criminal law and therefore in an effort, as it were, to insure us against excesses and if it is unrefined, it can be properly refined in conference, so that it occurred to me that if we limit technical assistance to the kind of acts or attempts to act by what is unlawful under the laws of the United States, we would be omitting this whole area with political connotations because obviously torture, barbarism, denial of confrontation, and so forth, are all unlawful under the laws of the United States.

I just submit that to my colleagues. As I say, I have no desire to stand in their way, but simply submit it as a way out of what seems to be a little dilemma of definition.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is not any dilemma as a matter of fact. The primary intent of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, is a limitation in an affirmative and constructive way.

It would not be necessary, in my judgment, to have the additional language proposed by the Senator from New York. With this discussion and explanation, it seems to me that the legislative history will be sufficiently adequate to satisfy the questions raised by the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will allow

October 2, 1973

me to proceed on my own time, as I am a conferee, I have such confidence in the views of the conferees that I would be prepared to say that if the Senator who proposed the proposition is willing that the amendment should be taken to conference, with the understanding that if, on further study, it needs the kind of refinement which I have suggested, it will be made, as our purpose is crystal clear, that we are confining it to acts criminal under the laws and the morality of the United States in terms of technical assistance and not other things.

Mr. HRUSKA. Speaking for myself, this Senator would have no objection to any additions. We have confidence in his objective and his desire to achieve it. I defer, however, to the chairman, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN).
—Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I would only say that, of course, no one has any desire here to try to help enforcement of the laws of a foreign country that would be in conflict with the laws of this country. The whole purpose is to protect the United States. I cannot conceive that we would be giving any technical assistance in connection with some crime that is generally not a crime in the United States. I do not see any real harm in the Senator's modification of the amendment, but I would suggest that the manager of the bill take it to conference and study it further. If this language is required or any other language to confine it as we intend it and as we made the legislative history here, to so incorporate it in the conference report.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. Let me make one other point, that we have various problems with the House conferees on the subject of germaneness. Maybe, and I submit this to Senator HRUSKA as well, we should make it larger rather than smaller, and take the amendment to conference so that we will have ample room in which to do whatever the intent of the matter indicates.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have no objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me say that we will accept the amendment so far as the authors of this amendment are concerned. We accept the amendment of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas accepts the modification?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is so modified.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment to incorporate the language of the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have a matter here that is for purposes of clarification of the intent of the committee's action as pointed out to me by staff members who prepared the report on the pending legislation. It relates to the amount of money authorized for the voluntary contributions programs in the United Nations. Under the original resolution, that sum was to be in toto about \$124 million, because of the further stipulation that 6 percent was to be an across-the-board cut in the aid programs.

In general, this cut was also made in the voluntary programs in the United Nations. It is our recollection that this was not the intent in the committee, for this reason: In the voluntary programs, the committee had accepted the point that due to the success of the Government of the United States in the preceding assembly last year of the United Nations in getting its regular budgetary percentage reduced to 25 percent, and because that success was tied to trying to hold the United Nations Development Program at the same figure last year, of \$90 million, out of this total, that the voluntary program appropriations were to be exempted from the 6 percent. Therefore, that is the purpose of the amendment which I have been instructed by the manager of the bill the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would be acceptable, as the manager, to him. I am simply spelling it out for the record. Because Congress, in its wisdom, added \$3 million to the UNICEF program under the United Nations, that sum already has been added. Thus, to adjust the books for the intent, the figure that would be restored is roughly \$7.8 million. That brings it to the balance of the original figure, plus the 6 percent we had cut out originally, unintentionally, in the report.

So my amendment, which I send to the desk, seeks to correct that factor. I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Virginia, who has a deep interest in this matter, and with others who had been involved in intent with respect to this matter. That is the essence of the explanation of the intent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, strike out line 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "each of the fiscal years 1974 and 1975 \$127,822,000."

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering to S. 2335 is designed to clear up a discrepancy between the line item on contributions to the United Nations voluntary funds approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the section of the committee report authorizing funding for the voluntary programs. I am joined in this effort by my distinguished colleagues from New York (Mr. JAVITS), Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON).

Briefly, the line item in the committee report called for an authorization of \$124,822,000 for U.N. voluntary programs.

However, the section of the report explaining our participation in these programs stipulated an authorization of \$120 million, with an additional \$3 million for UNICEF above the administration request.

The effect of this discrepancy is to leave us with a shortfall of \$7,822,000 authorized for the U.N. voluntary programs. Even though the line item authorization in the committee report calls for a \$90 million contribution to the United Nations Development Program, the shortfall would result in a \$7,822,000 decrease in our UNDP effort since that program is by far our largest contributive effort.

Since it is vital that our participation in UNDP be funded at a minimum level of \$90 million, my colleagues and I have offered this amendment to increase our total contribution to the voluntary programs by \$7,822,000 in fiscal 1974. Since this authorization bill is for fiscal years 1974 and 1975, our amendment does not place a restriction on any authorization for fiscal 1975.

The reason for this is simple. At a \$90 million level in fiscal 1974, our contribution to UNDP is about 28 percent of the total international contribution to this program. However, should we place a \$90 million restriction on our contribution for fiscal 1975, we would fall to about 22 percent of the total international participation in the program.

The United Nations Development Program is one of the most critical of the voluntary programs, both from our standpoint and from the standpoint of the developing world. The less developed nations of the world view our participation in this program as an indication of our commitment to the United Nations itself. During the 27th General Assembly of the United Nations, my primary responsibility, as a delegate, was to obtain General Assembly approval of the U.S. resolution calling for a reduction of our assessed contribution from 31.5 percent to 25 percent. As all of you are aware, we were successful in this effort. However, in order to alleviate fears on the part of many nations, including both the developed and less developed countries, I pointed out that we would actively seek to increase our participation in the voluntary programs as a visible sign that the United States was not attempting to downgrade its role at the U.N.

It is for this reason that the amendment actually contains two provisions—one which would increase our contribution to U.N. voluntary programs by \$7,822,000 in fiscal year 1974, and an open-ended provision for fiscal year 1975 which would allow us to contribute "such funds as may be necessary" to the voluntary agencies.

My colleagues who have joined me in this effort and I believe that it is vitally important that we demonstrate the United States has a continuing strong interest and stake in the United Nations. We, therefore, urge acceptance of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unan-

imous consent that time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and others.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, we have had a discussion of the perfecting language on the amendment which is at the desk. I am empowered by the manager of the bill to accept the language in order to clear up the intent.

Therefore, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I do not oppose what is advocated by the Senator from Wyoming, but I wish to reserve the right when the appropriation bill is before the Senate to give further consideration to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the time on this side. I yield back time on both sides if there is no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, no objection. We yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming and others.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask that I be permitted to submit a substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to substitute another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the Record, is as follows:

On page 31 after line 13, insert the following new section:

"RIGHTS IN CHILE

"Sec. 23. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that (1) the President should deny Chile any economic or military assistance, other than humanitarian assistance, until he finds that the Government of Chile is pro-

tecting the human rights of all individuals, Chilean and foreign, as provided in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, and other relevant international legal instruments guaranteeing the granting of asylum, safe conduct, and the humane treatment or release of prisoners; (2) that the President should support international humanitarian initiatives by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the International Committee of the Red Cross to insure the protection and safe conduct and resettlement of political refugees, the humane treatment of political prisoners, and the full inspection of detention facilities under international auspices; (3) that the President should be prepared to provide asylum and resettlement opportunities under appropriate provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act to a reasonable number of political refugees; (4) that the President should support and facilitate efforts by voluntary agencies to meet emergency relief needs; (5) that the President should request of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to undertake an immediate inquiry into recent events occurring in Chile."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I believe this is the minimum step that can be taken at this time to demonstrate our deep concern over events taking place in Chile and over the continued silence by the administration on human rights in Chile.

Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Congress resolution.

It would state:

First, that the President should deny any economic or military assistance, other than humanitarian aid, until the President certifies that Chile is respect universal declaration of human rights and other agreements concerning protection of refugees.

Second, that the President should encourage international humanitarian initiatives by the United Nation's high commissioner for refugees and the international committee of the Red Cross to insure the protection, safe conduct and resettlement of political refugees and the humane treatment.

Third, that the President should be prepared to provide asylum and resettlement opportunities under appropriate provisions of the immigration and nationality act to a reasonable number of political refugees.

Fourth, that the President should support and facilitate efforts by voluntary agencies to meet emergency relief needs.

And finally, that the President should request of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to undertake an immediate inquiry into recent events occurring in Chile.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am sure this amendment is very acceptable. If the Senator is agreeable, I believe we can move right along. I agree it is a minimum step but a very vital and important one, and we should have a vote on it.

Mr. President, this amendment expresses my own deep sense of shock at the continued violation of human rights occurring in Chile. I stand as well to condemn the continued silence of the Government of the United States, which has not issued a single public expression

of remorse over the military coup which toppled a democratically elected government or over the deaths, beatings, brutality, and repression which have occurred in that land.

Administration officials have said they have no confirmation of the reports of 8,000 to 12,000 dead or the reports of widespread summary executions.

Is not it enough that the junta itself has admitted summary executions? Is not it enough that books are being burned in the streets of Santiago? Is not it enough that witnesses have testified to hearing men moan from being beaten? Is not it enough that a military dictatorship is being erected, a military dictatorship which proudly extolls the example of Indonesia, where hundreds of thousands of people were slaughtered?

While our immediate concerns have been for the safety of Americans detained in Chile and in the threats to the lives of some 13,000 political refugees from other nations, we cannot fail to express our outrage at what has occurred to Chileans as well.

Beyond the summary execution of an untold number of Chileans and foreigners, the measures of repression include the abolition of the largest labor federation in Chile; the removal of all elected mayors and councilmen of city governments; the removal of all university rectors; the suspension of rights of all political parties; the suspension of the Congress; the imposition of heavy censorship on media permitted to operate and the suspension of all others; the suspension of civil rights and the civil system of law.

Two days from now, the World Congress of Parliamentarians was to have been held in Santiago, Chile. This inter-parliamentary session has been canceled because the Congress that issued that invitation no longer exists. The military junta has closed its doors, and has jailed or placed on wanted lists at least 20 Chilean Senators and 50 Chilean Representatives—men who were elected to office under the banner of legal political parties supporting the martyred President Salvador Allende.

I ask now and urge our Government to ask; where are these Chilean Congressmen and why are they not released or given an opportunity to emigrate in safety?

I ask now and urge our Government to ask as well, where are the men appointed to government posts under Allende and why are they not given their freedom, men like Orlando Letelier who served as Ambassador here in Washington and returned to Santiago a few months ago as Minister of Defense; men like Jacques Chonchol, former Minister of Agriculture; men like former minister Clodomiro Almeyda and other government appointees?

There is no middle ground. One cannot adhere to values of individual liberty and then remain silent while those values are destroyed. Nor can one applaud the rapid and willing recognition of the new regime 13 days after the overthrow of a democratic elected government. The explanation given was that we did not want to be the first nor the last to recognize

October 2, 1973

the junta as the government in fact in Chile.

Could we not at least have waited until the sound of gunfire had ceased to break the night in Santiago? Could we not have waited until submachinegun carrying soldiers no longer were on street corners, until the thousands imprisoned in Estadio Chile and Estadio Nacional had been released? Could we not have waited until political prisoners and political refugees had been given a chance to depart the country in safety? Could we not have waited until the blood stopped flowing in Chile?

Yesterday John Barnes of Newsweek magazine reported a series of events that reflect the worst as to the magnitude of the disregard for human lives and human rights of the military junta. Barnes reported seeing 150 dead bodies in the city's morgue, most apparently executed by a single shot under the chin and others submachinegunned. The next day he returned and found another 70 bodies.

The Senate Subcommittee on Refugees, which I serve as chairman, held a hearing last Friday at which American citizens who had left Chile in the past few days testified. All testified to the atmosphere of fear that pervaded the country. Two who had been imprisoned in Estadio Nacional testified to watching groups of 30 led onto the playing field and then heard bursts of gunfire; then only the guards returned. Another testified to being told by a dental surgeon who had been in Estadio Chile that he had seen three Bolivians led off after an officer ordered "Liquideos"—get rid of them. Moments later, the surgeon heard a short burst of submachinegun fire and the sound of bodies falling to the ground.

The subcommittee also has received information from the head of an American institution in Chile who was told on the day of the coup by an army colonel—who was in favor of the coup but horrified by the brutality taking place—that 200 Chileans had been interrogated and then summarily executed. The staff also learned that the head of a Chilean educational institution had been called to the morgue to identify a student who had been detained by the military. The student reportedly had been shot in the face. The educator also saw some 100 bodies, all apparently shot, still unidentified in the morgue. Finally, an estimate of the number of dead from an American in an official capacity was reported as between 8,000 to 12,000.

What is most frightening is that these are the reports we have heard from Santiago alone. From the country's interior, there has been virtually no news. And if the evidence of tanks rumbling through the poor barrios of Santiago is any indication, it is among the poor, those who identified most with the Allende regime, where the military has been least restrained. What will come from the countryside in the next several weeks may be the worst yet to be made public.

Along with Senator MATTHEWS, I introduced a resolution a week ago, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my re-

marks. That resolution urges the President to request the Government of Chile to respect the provisions of the universal declaration of human rights and other international agreements concerning refugees and political prisoners. That is still to be done.

I also have requested the following:

First, our Government—at the highest levels—should give some public assurance of active concern over the bloodshed and violation of human rights in Chile.

Second, our Government should make strong diplomatic representations to the military government of Chile, in support of international humanitarian initiatives in behalf of Chilean national and foreign residents, in need of protection and help. Specifically, our Government should strongly support efforts by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees to insure the protection, and safe conduct to resettlement elsewhere, of political refugees in Chile. We should also strongly support efforts by the international committee of the Red Cross to insure the humane treatment of political prisoners and full inspection of detention facilities under Red Cross auspices.

Third, as we do for refugees from other areas, our Government should be prepared to provide asylum and resettlement opportunities to a reasonable number of political refugees from Chile, under the parole provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Fourth, our Government should immediately support and facilitate efforts of voluntary agencies and others in helping to meet any emergency relief needs—including food and medicines—resulting from the civil strife in Chile.

Fifth, with the exception of emergency humanitarian assistance to the people of Chile, we should be in no hurry to provide any assistance to a regime which has come to power through a violent military coup—especially after years of denying bilateral economic assistance and impeding multilateral assistance to a democratically elected government. Clearly, we should halt all military assistance to that government.

The policy of this administration toward the previous government of Chile places a special responsibility on the United States in the case of Chile.

From the IIT hearings conducted by the Senate Subcommittee on Multinational Corporations of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we learned that the so-called Forty Committee, including representatives of the National Security Council, the CIA and other intelligence agencies, as well as the Armed Forces met as early as June 1970 to approve a covert propaganda campaign against the candidacy of the Allende ticket. We know that a further meeting of this body met soon after President Allende received a majority of the votes cast in Chile's presidential election. Subsequently we know that there was frequent contact between IIT and CIA officials concerning the possibility of exerting economic pressures on the Allende government.

We have seen the evidence of a policy of economic denial imposed by this ad-

ministration. The administration blocked Export-Import Bank financing of commercial jets for Chile's National Airlines as a way of pressuring Chile on the matter of the copper expropriation.

In the Inter-American Development Bank and other multilateral lending organizations, similar heavy-handed policies were used to impede almost all new loans to Chile.

Our own bilateral development loans to Chile came to a halt. Only in the area of military assistance did we continue to provide aid. In 1971, we provided \$5 million in military credits to Chile and again in December 1972 we provided \$10 million in credits. Once more this year we extended additional credits for the purchase of F-5E fighter jets.

These policies clearly produced additional severe pressures on the Allende regime and contributed to an unknown degree to the cascading economic difficulties that set the stage for the recent military coup.

For all of these reasons, I would hope that there would be a special sense of responsibility on the part of this Government to do everything in its power to try and protect the rights of all individuals now threatened by the military rule in Chile—150 years ago, Simon Bolivar wrote his "Letter From Jamaica" offering this prediction:

If any American republic is to have a long life, I am inclined to believe it will be Chile. There the spirit of liberty has never been extinguished . . . in a word, it is possible for Chile to be free.

To a great degree since 1830, Chile has been free and democratic and this history, a history that has earned Chile the admiration of free men everywhere, makes what has taken place in the last 2 weeks more difficult to accept and more tragic to witness.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SLAUGHTERHOUSE IN SANTIAGO

Pablo Neruda, Chile's Nobel Prize-winning poet, was dead of cancer, and even as his body was lowered into its grave, his countrymen set about trying to murder his words. Books of all kinds, not only Neruda's but those by Mao and Marx and Marcuse, were seized by the tens of thousands from homes, bookstores and libraries and then fed to bonfires in the streets of Santiago. And the military junta that has ruled Chile for three weeks didn't stop there. Chilean universities, once proud bastions of independence, were purged of suspected leftists, and ordinary people learned to dread the midnight knock on the door. All that was bad enough, but Newsweek correspondent John Barnes discovered last week that the reign of terror has already gone much further than most people thought. Below, Barnes's report:

The military junta will not admit that there have been mass executions since the overthrow of Salvador Allende's Marxist government. "We have executed perhaps eight people since then for shooting at troops," Col. Pedro Ewing told newsmen. But that simply is not true. Last week, I slipped through a side door into the Santiago city morgue, flashing my junta press pass with all the impatient authority of a high official. One hundred and fifty dead bodies were laid out on the ground floor, awaiting identification by family members. Upstairs, I passed through a swing door and there in a dimly

October 2, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S 18411

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000600170001-1

lit corridor lay at least 50 more bodies, squeezed one against another, their heads propped up against the wall. They were all naked.

Most had been shot at close range under the chin. Some had been machine-gunned in the body. Their chests had been slit open and sewn together grotesquely in what presumably had been a pro forma autopsy. They were all young and, judging from the roughness of their hands, all from the working class. A couple of them were girls, distinguishable among the massed bodies only by the curves of their breasts. Most of their heads had been crushed. I remained for perhaps two minutes at most, then left the building.

The next day I returned to the morgue with a Chilean friend so that I would have a witness. I also took along a camera. As I walked through the swing doors of the corridor, the sickly sweet smell of the decomposing bodies almost knocked me back. There were more bodies, perhaps 70, and they were different from the day before. Just as I was pulling the camera from my jacket, a man in a white coat walked through the doors at the other end of the corridor. "What do you want?" he asked. "I'm looking for the bathroom," I said. "Come with me," he said. As I followed him, I took a sharp right and ran out of the building. He shouted after me but did not try to follow. I did not have the courage to try again. Later, in my hotel room, my friend burst into tears. "These were my countrymen," he cried. "My God, what has happened to us?"

BODIES

Workers at the morgue have been warned that they will be court-martialed and shot if they reveal what is going on there. But I was able to obtain an official morgue body-count from the daughter of a member of its staff: by the fourteenth day following the coup, she said, the morgue had received and processed 2,796 corpses.

No one knows how many have been disposed of elsewhere; a gravedigger told me of reports that helicopters have been gathering bodies at the emergency first-aid center in central Santiago, then carrying them out to sea to be dumped. One priest informed me that on the Saturday after the coup he had managed to get into the City's Technical University, which had been the scene of heavy fighting, on the pretext of blessing the dead. He told me he saw 200 bodies, all piled together. Tales like that abound in Santiago, and though information is almost nonexistent for the rest of Chile, the presumption is that the executions have followed a similar pattern in other cities. But the morgue count alone sets the regime's kill rate at an appalling 200 Chileans a day—just for the capital.

With hardly an exception—the victims come from the *poblaciones*—the slums that encircle Santiago and house half the city's 4 million inhabitants. During the three turbulent years of Salvador Allende's administration, the poor of the *poblaciones* never wavered in their support of his government, for the fact was that the *rotos* (broken-down ones, as they are contemptuously called by the more affluent) had never had it so good. Despite the soaring inflation, they earned enough money to buy undreamed-of luxuries, like new clothes, radios, television sets, refrigerators. Community food-distribution centers in the *poblaciones* were always well stocked, while the shelves of stores elsewhere remained barren. Presumably, the junta believes that since the *poblaciones* provided the former government's main support, they must be terrorized into accepting the fact of its demise. So the local leaders are now paying with their lives for their love of Allende. Not one *población* has escaped the terror.

ROUNDUP

I spoke with three women from the Pincoya *población*. One of them, a mother of two, had just found out that she was a widow. She told me this tearful story: "Soldiers raided our *población* last Saturday at 8 in the morning. In the section where we live, they rounded up about 50 men and held them until a police lieutenant came to take his pick. When the lieutenant saw my husband, he made him step forward and told him: 'Now you will pay for all you people have done.' The *carabineros* took him and a few others to the police station, and the rest were arrested by soldiers." For three days, she and the other women of Pincoya searched for their men in police stations and the two soccer stadiums where thousands are incarcerated. It was only after they heard that a 17-year-old boy from their block had been found at the morgue—shot in the head and chest—that they made the journey to see the lists of the dead. There they found her husband, Gabriel, as well as every adult male from one block of their *población*.

I joined a funeral procession of weeping families following three coffins to burial. *Carabineros*, I was told, had raided a home in the Parque Santa Maria *población* and had picked up three petty thieves aged 18, 19 and 20. A sergeant told them they would be released if they paid 7,000 escudos—only \$5, but a lot of money to the *población* poor. Their barrio raised the money and the youths returned home. But two hours later, a *carabiniro* patrol came back to get them. That was the last their families heard, until they found their names on the morgue list. One of the boys was so riddled with bullets that they could hardly dress him for burial. But the fate of the other two was worse. Coffins in Chile have small window doors over the face of the dead, and the women opened them for me. There were no heads inside.

Orlando Contreras, who lives with his wife and seven children in the José Maria Caro *población*, is in daily dread of an official knock at his door. He is a laborer who worked in Santiago's office of social development, a particular target of the new regime. And he is well aware of the danger he faces, should the soldiers come after him. On the day the coup took place, he told me, he and one of his sons saw ten high-school students marched from their school, their hands over their heads, after a brief skirmish with *carabineros*. They were forced to lie face down on the ground, and then a policeman walked the line of prone youngsters, spraying them with machinegun fire.

The stories of atrocities are endless, and by now, inhabitants of the *poblaciones* are utterly terrified. I am too afraid to look for him," says a woman from the Ultima Hora *población*, whose husband was last seen covered with blood being hauled away in a police truck. I am afraid that they will take me, too, and what would happen then to my four children? Many are now afraid even to associate with families that had any connection with Allende's regime—whether as party members, union leaders or employees in the food-distribution centers. "They can kill whomever they want to kill," says Contreras bitterly. "There is nothing absolutely nothing, that we can do about it."

Because of the total censorship of domestic reporting, most middle- and upper-class Chileans have no idea what is happening. They hear rumors, but their hatred for Allende compounded by their historic contempt for the *rotos* leaves them little desire to verify them. Many do not believe the stories about slaughter in the *poblaciones*; many simply don't much care. "Why should we?" a Chilean lawyer asked me over an expansive lunch in a wealthy section of Santiago. "I don't believe the stories you tell me, but after the

things the supporters of Salvador Allende had done to Chile, they deserve whatever happens to them."

CHILEAN MILITARY WORRYING CHURCH JUNTA'S AUTHORITARIAN ACTS ARE CAUSING CONCERN

(By Marvive Howe)

SANTIAGO, CHILE, September 30.—Chile's Roman Catholic bishops have offered to cooperate with the ruling junta in the "reconstruction" of the country, but there is deep malaise in church circles over the continuing violence and the authoritarian actions of the military since it seized power nearly three weeks ago.

At least two priests have died in the wave of repression against sympathizers of the former leftist Government. A number of Chilean priests, particularly in the provinces, have been arrested, warned not to engage in politics and released.

Foreign priests have been a special target of the military. Some have been expelled—at least two Americans, two Canadians and several Dutchmen and Spaniards. Strong pressure has also been put on four French priests to leave the country.

"They hold us responsible for bringing Marxism and class struggle into the country," a foreign priest ordered to leave the country declared bitterly.

Christians for Socialism, a group of some 200 priests and other church people who supported the social aims of the late President Salvador Allende Gossens, has gone into recess and some of its leaders are in hiding.

Gonzalo Arroyo, the group's head, has twice been interrogated by the military authorities but declines to make any public statement.

One of the gravest acts of the new military authorities, according to sources close to the Catholic hierarchy, is the decision of few days ago to name military men as rectors in all universities. The move was expected to bring protests from the Vatican.

HELP FOR PRISONERS

The Catholic University of Chile has always enjoyed special status, even under the President Allende, a marxist. The university chancellor, who was approved by the Pope, had the power to ratify the nomination of the rectors.

The Archbishop of Santiago, Raul Cardinal Silva Henríquez, has publicly supported the military in its declared aim of "achieving a true social justice."

At the same time, however, he is known to be working quietly to help prisoners and to obtain guarantees for foreign refugees. He has visited the National Stadium, where up to 7,000 people are detained, and taken help and transmitted messages for prisoners.

Cardinal Silva Henríquez ardently supported discussions between President Allende and the dominant opposition party, the Christian Democrats, and until the end played the role of mediator in an attempt to spare the country from violent confrontation.

However, most Christian Democrats, led by former President Eduardo Frei Montalva, opposed any compromise with President Allende, according to church sources.

"They favored a white coup—a peaceful intervention by the military, with the ousting of Allende—and sincerely thought the armed forces would call for elections in a month or so," an aide of the Cardinal said, critical of such "naiveté."

Many priests and staunch Christian Democrats who disapproved of President Allende's hurried moves toward socialism, have been dismayed by the new regime's use of force and its arbitrary measures, such as the closing of congress, the outlawing of leftist parties, the burning of Marxist books and the

Approved For Release 2001/08/30 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000600170001-1

October 2, 1973

dissolution of the Central Workers Confederation, the country's largest labor organization.

The permanent committee of the Chilean episcopate, led by Cardinal Silva Henríquez, visited the junta Friday to offer its "cooperation in the spiritual and material development of Chile." A communiqué issued at the close of the audience stressed the wish of the church to participate in "the pacification of spirits and in guaranteeing and developing the social gains of the workers."

ALARMED BY REPRESSION

The bishops are said to be alarmed over the repression that has been unleashed since the coup, often by lower-ranking officers and apparently without the knowledge of the junta.

An office has been set up within the church to look into abuses of human rights and acts of violence toward workers, who generally supported the Allende Government, as well as toward religious missions.

One case involved the Rev. Juan Alcina, a Spanish priest of the Catholic Action Workers Movement, who was arrested on Sept. 18. The Archbishop was notified of the priest's arrest but could not contact him.

Several days later a body with 10 bullet holes in the back was found in the Mapocho River. A Spanish consul identified the body as that of Father Alcina.

A Chilean priest, Miguel Woodward, who lived and worked in a slum district in the port city of Valparaíso and taught a course in trade unionism in the Catholic University, was arrested and beaten "savagely," according to church sources. He died from his wounds in a Valparaíso hospital.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator for his remarks on this subject.

Previously I placed in the RECORD an article which was published in Newsweek magazine of this week by American newspaperman John Barnes calling attention to the slaughter in Santiago. If this is true, and I understand he is a reputable newsman, this is one of the most reprehensible, illegal takeovers of a government I have ever heard of.

Mr. President, I support the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the Senator as a cosponsor of the amendment.

I have been asked by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) that he be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to be listed as a cosponsor also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE. As far as I know there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time if the Senator from Massachusetts is ready to yield back his time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did the Senator ask that the additional cosponsors be added?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the additional cosponsors be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts and others.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 569

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 31, line 14, insert the following:

SEC. 24. BUREAU OF HUMANITARIAN AND SOCIAL SERVICES.--It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish within the Department of State a Bureau of Humanitarian and Social Services to be headed by an Assistant Secretary of State who is appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Bureau of Humanitarian and Social Services should provide continuing guidance and coordination to policies, activities, and programs within the executive branch relating to humanitarian assistance for refugees and victims of natural disasters, migration and visa affairs, international human rights, liaison with the United Nations and other appropriate international agencies or non-governmental organizations, and such other humanitarian and social affairs as the Secretary of State may prescribe.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment would establish a Bureau of Humanitarian and Social Services within the Department of State. This is an idea and a concept which has been reviewed by the Committee on Foreign Relations. They refer to it positively on page 26 of their report and I commend them for doing so.

This is an attempt to institutionalize humanitarian policies and programs within the Department of State, so that we can respond more immediately and in a continuing basis and in a significant way to the basic humanitarian issues and problems that come before the world and the American people.

We have seen recently the types of situations that draw our attention to Sahel, the area below the Sahara Desert, where hundreds of thousands of people are starving in the Nicaraguan situation, the flooding in Pakistan, the Bangladesh situation, and the past problems in Nigeria-Biafra. Enormous numbers of lives have been lost and in many instances the United States responded in a positive way, but it always takes a good deal of time before we are able to put into motion the kinds of efforts which could have meant the saving of hundreds of thousands of lives.

This amendment attempts to coordinate the various humanitarian assistance programs that exist in the executive branch. It is not a new idea. It has been urged since 1963, so it has been around

for 7 or 8 years. This approach is familiar to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I am hopeful that the amendment may be accepted and taken to conference, and, hopefully, accepted within the conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. An explanation of this item appears on page 26 of the committee report, which I ask unanimous consent to be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COORDINATION OF HUMANITARIAN AND DISASTER RELIEF

The Committee considers the humanitarian relief assistance for refugees and victims of disaster in other countries to be a vital part of our foreign aid programs. This kind of relief aid reflects the humanitarian concerns of the American people, and its delivery should be as prompt and efficient as possible.

Over the years since World War II, the authority for the conduct of these relief activities has been dispersed among several offices and bureaus within the foreign policy establishment. Budget items for refugee and disaster assistance are scattered over many agencies of the government. The Committee views this situation with concern, believing that improved coordination of these activities is desirable in order to provide Congress and the public with a true picture of the scope and effectiveness of these activities. In addition, the Committee considers that improved communication between government officials and the private voluntary overseas relief agencies is urgently needed. These agencies in 1972 provided \$430 million in disaster and refugee relief assistance, or about 60% of the total humanitarian relief assistance, public and private, which flowed from this country. The voluntary agencies serve as the delivery systems for much of the humanitarian aid provided by the United States government and they carry by far the greatest number of direct contacts with refugees and disaster victims in recipient countries.

The Committee is aware of the several proposals for the creation of a single high level official with authority to coordinate all of the humanitarian relief activities conducted by the United States. Most, if not all, of these proposals call for making such an official the focal point for liaison and cooperation with private voluntary relief activities. While it has not acted to report new legislative authority for the creation of such an official, the Committee wishes to make plain its view that the need for improved coordination remains acute and urges appropriate action by the Administration to meet this need, thus possibly avoiding the need for legislative action.

As domestic priorities assert themselves, and the United States moves to realign its far-flung overseas commitments, the role of the voluntary relief agencies in the delivery of critically needed disaster and refugee assistance is likely to grow. It is the Committee's view that the Department of State and the Agency for International Development should give support and encouragement to the voluntary agencies when they move in response to appeals for such assistance from abroad.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the committee has expressed the fact that it looks with considerable favor upon the creation of a single high official with authority to coordinate all these humani-

tarian activities. The amendment of the Senator expresses that same attitude and feeling in a sense-of-Congress citation, so to speak.

I think this is a worthy amendment, and that we should accept it. If the Senator is agreeable to that, we will get to a voice vote and accept the amendment. I yield back my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 570.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 570 is as follows:

On page 31, line 14, insert the following:
Sec. 23. HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE IN SOUTH ASIA.—The President is authorized to furnish humanitarian assistance, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in support of the repatriation and exchange of minority populations between Pakistan and Bangladesh. There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purpose of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year 1974, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have an amendment that we are going to offer here for disaster relief, of which the Senator is a cosponsor. It relates to several countries.

I wonder if we could not include this amendment within the context of that amendment. I am just making that suggestion in the hope, of course, that the Senate will see fit to accept disaster relief additions in the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. Would the Senator be adding the \$150 million for disaster relief, or just earmarking, in the amendment that he will offer?

Mr. HUMPHREY. We add additional funds.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would be glad to coordinate this effort. All we are doing here is earmarking for the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which would represent the United States' fair share for the exchange and resettlement of the Pakistanis and Bengalis under the agreement recently concluded in South Asia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it a new section that the Senator is seeking to add to the bill, or is this a section in the existing bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. This would be a new section to the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do I understand that this is not additional funding?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is to be taken out of disaster relief funds or contingency funds?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is correct.

It could be taken out of existing funds within the legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The language that the Senator has in his amendment indicates that "There is authorized to be appropriated to the President for the purpose of this section, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$6 million for the fiscal year 1974, which amounts are authorized to remain available until expended."

That is an addition in the bill.

I understand the importance of it, and I am sure my sympathy is with it, but if the Senator could keep his language so that funds would come out of funds authorized within the bill and leave it to the discretion of the President to be able to find those funds—and there surely is within the contingency funds such authority—we could go along with that amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. If the amendment, therefore, could comply with the suggestion of the manager of the bill, that would be satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the modification to the desk?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make a comment about it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. We heard earlier in the day the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee speak of the fact that the authorities are contemplating aid to Chile. That was one reason why he was against the bill.

I had, prior to that, suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts, who had initiated this matter, that I would be glad to join in respect to this effort.

I think, the point having been made that this is a desirable addition, the modification suggested by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) is what the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was trying to do, himself, with my cooperation, in respect to the funding which is contained in the first clause of his bill. I should like to say to the Senator that I think it is very distinguished service in respect to the bill at this time, within the present-day framework, and that it should carry this particular provision.

Am I joined in the amendment as a cosponsor?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that the language following line 7 read as follows, in lieu of the language that is now in the amendment:

There is authorized to be used by the President for the purpose of this section \$6 million for the fiscal year 1974 out of funds authorized and appropriated to carry out this Act.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is satisfactory. Mr. President, and it carries out the intent of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I send the modified amendment to the desk.

Mr. KENNEDY. I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 571

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 571. I ask that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 26, strike lines 1 through 11 and insert the following:

PART V—POSTWAR RELIEF, REHABILITATION, AND RECONSTRUCTION IN SOUTH VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, AND LAOS

SEC. 801. GENERAL AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to furnish, on such terms and conditions as he may determine, assistance for the relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, especially humanitarian assistance for refugees, civilian war casualties, war orphans, and other persons disadvantaged by hostilities or conditions relating to those hostilities, and reconstruction assistance for the rebuilding of civilian facilities damaged or destroyed by those hostilities in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Assistance for such purposes, shall be distributed to the maximum extent practicable under the auspices of and by the United Nations, other international organizations, multilateral institutions, and private voluntary agencies with a minimum presence and activity of United States Government personnel.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there are two objectives of the amendment in changing the language of the authorization, to make it clear that, first, humanitarian assistance is the first priority of our foreign aid funds to Indochina.

We spell out that the first priority of our aid funds should be for refugees, civilians who are casualties of the war, orphans, and other persons disadvantaged by the hostilities.

The second purpose of the amendment is to urge that to the maximum extent practical we proceed through international voluntary and multinational agencies, with a minimum presence of U.S. Government personnel. I know it was the intention of the committee itself to make sure that this kind of general assistance be made available through international efforts. This is an attempt to focus on United Nations, specialized agencies, and voluntary groups. That is where this assistance should go. That is where the greatest need is.

There are about 1 million orphans in Vietnam. Hundreds of thousands of people have lost arms and legs. About 300,000 are widows. Thousands have been wounded and maimed. There is a fundamental need for assistance to these war victims.

The amendment is an effort to make sure that the first order of priority will go toward meeting their needs. Second, and to the extent possible, we should work through national or multinational agencies. The most effective work being done today in that field is through such agencies. That has been true for the last 10 years.

It is in an effort to maximize their efforts and to minimize the use of direct U.S. Government personnel that this amendment is directed and focused.

Mr. President, I think the language of the committee states quite clearly the intent that I would hope would be achieved by this language. I would hope that, since it is really consistent with the thrust of the Foreign Relations Committee report, it will be accepted by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield time to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think the important thing for us to note is that it replaces the general authority set forth at page 26, really lines 1 through 11. It simply repeats the title, except that it includes the word "rehabilitation."

However, as to the substance, I think it says that the President is authorized to furnish such assistance as he may determine for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, and it includes humanitarian assistance.

The Senator from Massachusetts changes the word "include" to "especially" as found on line 7 of his amendment.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the President was given broad authority, I personally would not see any great objections to it. However, I would want to point out to the Senate that it does at least tell him we consider the first priority would be the various elements of humanitarian assistance which the Senator from Massachusetts emphasized when he changed the word "include," which means that it has equal priority, to the word "especially," which would give the Foreign Relations Committee in respect of legislative oversight the right to claim that it had a priority. That is one distinction.

The other distinction that I think we ought to be aware of is, "... assistance for such purposes shall be distributed to the maximum extent practicable under the auspices of and by the United Nations, other international organizations, multilateral institutions, and private voluntary agencies with a minimum presence and activity of U.S. Government personnel."

I would like the Senator to tell us why he feels he wants to be so restrictive. I would personally prefer it if he could say that assistance for such purposes shall be distributed insofar as practicable under the auspices of and by the United Nations, other international organizations, multilateral institutions, and private voluntary organizations.

I see no reason why we should bow out of it by restricting ourselves to a minimum presence and activity of the United

States Government personnel. That would be drawing into the woodwork, seems to me.

I suggest that rather than leave it to the conference to try to define this, we do it right here and now and strike the word "to" at the end of line 2 on line 3 strike the words "the maximum extent" and say "insofar as practicable" and so forth, and put a period at the end of the word "agencies" on line 5.

In that way I would consider that the amendment would be entirely appropriate to give at least a claimed priority to these highly humanitarian purposes and not absolutely to the hands of the United States in the administration of its AID program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Senator is quite correct in analyzing the changes that would be made if the Senate were to agree to the amendment.

The clear intention of the amendment is to put a high priority on the humanitarian needs of the people of Indochina. It has been evident to me for some period of time that when there is a choice between the humanitarian needs and other needs, the other needs—military supplies, general economic aid—get taken care of first.

The record is replete with examples of this. It was the intention of the amendment to indicate by the words "especially humanitarian" a sense of our priority for the war victims of this ravaged part of the world, to indicate to the greatest extent possible that it will be the purpose and the function of our aid program to meet these basic and fundamental humanitarian needs first.

Mr. President, the word "especially" was added to give that emphasis, so that priority would be maintained.

The reason for emphasizing the United Nations and the specialized agencies, is to move toward building upon the humanitarian expertise and the knowledge and understanding that has been developed within recent times in these bodies. The specialized agencies of the United Nations have been enormously successful in responding to humanitarian problems in other parts of the world.

I think that the specialized agencies of the United Nations have made a most impressive record since the earliest days of the United Nations and are continuing to do so under the United Nations umbrella, in Bangladesh, for example, where they have been most effective in marshaling the support of other nations. And the United States is making its contributions, but under the U.N. umbrella. There are brought into this situation hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars from other countries.

I have been impressed by the fact that many other countries in other parts of the world are willing to participate in this humanitarian assistance. I think that to the extent we maintain a very close or dominating relationship with aid programs, we will discourage the active participation in humanitarian problems of other nations, and we will not be as effective in the utilization of the various international organizations in the areas which I think they have been so successful in the past.

We have tried to indicate some flexibility for the administration by saying "To the maximum extent practicable." I know that the Senator suggests "so far as practicable."

However, I do feel that, given their track records on meeting humanitarian needs and problems, unless we give some sense of urgency and some degree of direction, I am afraid that this thrust may be lost.

I am glad to work with the Senator from New York, however, in attempting to meet both of the aims.

But this is the reason for the language: "the maximum extent practicable," to capitalize upon the expertise and the assistance of the United Nations' specialized agencies, along with other international agencies. And most importantly it is beginning to bring those groups into play so that other countries around the world can help underwrite humanitarian assistance.

I am absolutely convinced that they will. They have, as the Senator from New York, who is very familiar with humanitarian problems in all parts of the world, understands rather well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would hope that the Senator would accept the following suggestion. On lines 2 and 3 of page 2, strike out "to the maximum extent and insert in lieu thereof the word "wherever". And beginning with line 5, after the word "agencies" insert a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

On that basis, I would be prepared on our side to accept the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Well, I think that is acceptable, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. To change "to the maximum extent practicable" to "wherever practicable under the auspices of and by the United Nations, other international organizations, multilateral institutions, and private voluntary agencies."

I think if that is really carried through, there may be corresponding language in other parts of the legislation, so the earlier language may very well be redundant.

I move that my amendment be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. I send to the desk another amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how many amendments does the Senator have?

Mr. KENNEDY. One more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this a printed amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not a printed amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. No, it is not a printed amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY's amendment is as follows:

On page 26 strike line 12 through 17 and insert the following:

"Sec. 802. AUTHORIZATION.—(a) There are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out the purposes of this chapter, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the fiscal year 1974 not to exceed \$376,000,000, which amount is authorized to remain available until expended.

(b) Of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) of this section for the fiscal year 1974, not less than \$10,000,000 shall be available until expended to support humanitarian programs of the Indochina Operations Group of the International Red Cross in South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment provides for the earmarking of a \$10 million contribution for the Indochina Operations Group—IOG—of the International Red Cross for humanitarian programs in Indochina.

I might indicate to my good friend from Michigan why the amendment is unprinted. It is because it was only today that I received a telegram from the Red Cross in Geneva, Switzerland, in response to my earlier inquiry of a number of days ago, September 13, about the particular humanitarian needs in Cambodia.

Our committee had received assurances from the administration that all is being done that was required of the various humanitarian agencies, until as of this morning, when I received this telegram indicating that the Red Cross itself is handicapped and limited by the financial limitations that it has in providing, again, for basic humanitarian needs in Cambodia.

As I understand, the administration has gone ahead earlier today, and communicated to Geneva that they will be willing to provide some assistance to the Red Cross. This amendment is basically to provide that of the \$376 million reconstruction aid for all of Indochina \$10 million be earmarked for the Red Cross Indochina Operations Group, for relief purposes in Cambodia.

I am sure that they will end up with a good deal more funds than the \$10 million, but I do feel that if they felt assured, as of now, that at least they would be able to get \$10 million, they would be able to develop the programing which is so essential in terms of saving lives.

But that is the reason, because this communication reached me only this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, might I just say to the Senator, this amendment has just come to us out of the cold blue, so to speak, without any advance information or knowledge about it. Is it the intent of the amendment to add this amount?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, it is just to earmark—there is provided \$376 million in reconstruction funds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. This would earmark of that sum \$10 million for the Cambodian refugee program as sponsored by the Indochina Operations Group at the Red Cross.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[TELEGRAM—SEPT. 28, 1973]

To: Senator KENNEDY.

From: Olaf Stroh IOG.

Reference your telegram 13 September 1973 appreciate your encouraging interest for Red Cross activities in Cambodia. Despite difficult conditions IOG already undertook measures to try to obtain establishment of neutral zones. Several medical teams permanently on the spot working for sick and wounded. Emergency assistance also given especially to displaced persons such as shelters and additional nutrition to children. Are conscious that far greater assistance badly needed in Cambodia but have to adapt our activities to limited financial resources put at our disposal by Governments and National Societies for the total programme in all Indochina.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that out of the \$376 million which is authorized in this bill, any amount the Government feels would be needed could be authorized?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct. I am convinced that they can. The Red Cross will, in fact, probably get a good deal more than these amounts. But it would give them the assurance at the present time, when they say their effectiveness in increasing humanitarian assistance is limited. This kind of assurance would let them go ahead with and pursue their humanitarian responsibilities and at least be assured that they will be able to obtain resources to this extent.

This does not add any additional money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that there may be a number of other organizations that would want funds earmarked?

I say to the Senator, I understand the importance of helping the International Red Cross. I know, as the Senator has indicated and as we have stated here on the floor, that in the \$376 million category of relief and assistance to Indochina areas, funds could be made available for Cambodia, or for Cambodian humanitarian assistance.

I wonder if we could not settle for just having this colloquy, and include in the legislative history of this bill that we would expect funds to be made available to the International Red Cross because it is a highly respectable and accepted organization. I hesitate to start the process of earmarking for one orga-

nization, because the next thing we will have church groups and civic groups one after another coming in, and it is very difficult to turn one down by legislative action.

Mr. KENNEDY. Of course, I draw a distinction between earmarking for a church group and earmarking for an international organization, which in this case is the International Red Cross. Rather than it being a general kind of a statement that they are doing useful work, and therefore we ought to support them, they have made a direct appeal to our Government. I would like to just read this portion of the message from Olaf Stroh, who, as I indicated earlier, is the director of the Red Cross Indochina operations group in Geneva:

Reference your telegram 13 September 1973 appreciate your encouraging interest for Red Cross activities in Cambodia. Despite difficult conditions IOG already undertook measures to try to obtain establishment of neutral zones. Several medical teams permanently on the spot working for sick and wounded. Emergency assistance also given especially to displaced persons such as shelters and additional nutrition to children. Are conscious that far greater assistance badly needed in Cambodia but have to adapt our activities to limited financial resources put at our disposal by Governments and National Societies for the total programme in all Indochina.

This appeal to the United States has been in effect, really, since last spring, and I regret, too, that we have to take particular appeals and try to respond through legislation. But we have had this appeal now for a number of months. I, too, regret that we have to take the time of the Senate to earmark in these particular areas, but what we have here is a thoroughly creditable, reputable organization and they find limited ability to move in humanitarian areas because of the financial constraints. I am convinced that over any period of time they will probably receive not just these funds but a good deal more. The fact that we earmark these now would give assurance to the organization that they could move ahead, which will result in the saving of many lives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Might I say to the Senator that I understand the cogency of his argument. I listened to the telegram he read. I think that we can manage this all right. I would come out of the \$376 million, with no additional funds needed. The International Red Cross, of course, is a highly reputable and respected organization.

I would suggest that we take this to conference and if we have any difficulties, we will discuss it with the Senator before we finally dispose of it.

So I am prepared to accept the amendment and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on this amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator and his staff on their prodigious work.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY). The amendment will be stated. The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. This is not a new subject. It has been debated and talked about—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts as drafted amends a part of the bill which has been already stricken.

Mr. KENNEDY. All right, Mr. President, I will yield the floor at this time and will attempt to redraft or restructure the amendment to the existing legislation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then the Senator withdraws his amendment temporarily?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is temporarily withdrawn.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. —

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Florida have the floor now?

Mr. CHILES. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Could I ask the Senator from Florida to call up at this time the amendment that relates to the medical aspects first, and dispose of that one first.

Mr. CHILES. Of course, Mr. President, I send to the desk a second amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Intended to be proposed by Mr. CHILES to S. 2335, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

On page 27 between lines 19 and 20 insert the following new section:

"SEC. 804. CENTER FOR PLASTIC AND RECONSTRUCTIVE SURGERY IN SAIGON.—Of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 802 for the fiscal year 1974, not less than \$712,000 shall be available solely for furnishing assistance to the Center for Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery in Saigon."

On page 27, line 20, strike out "sec. 804" and insert in lieu thereof "sec. 805".

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, let me explain what the amendment would do. It would earmark funds for assisting the Center for Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery in Saigon. It would earmark \$712,000 for that Center. This language has been voted on before. It was in the House bill. It was left out of the bill this time in committee. It is a project we are well aware of and the great amount of work that needs to be done in the field of reconstructive plastic surgery in Saigon and how much the Center is doing in that way. As I say, the Senate has been on record as supporting this in the past.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a modest request in an area that is in great need of the kind of work the Senator from Florida has described. I

want to commend him for his thoughtfulness in bringing this to our attention. It will mean, if the amendment is adopted—and we will have no problem in the conference with it—that we will have the matter sealed down so that I would hope all of us would accept the amendment.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I am introducing an amendment today which would earmark funds for the furnishing of assistance to the Center for Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery in Saigon.

I first became acquainted with the Children's Medical Relief International—CMRI—through an editorial in the Gainesville Sun Newspaper. Later, in an article in Time magazine, I learned that the center was the only facility in South Vietnam dedicated to providing plastic and reconstructive surgery for children.

Mr. President, I wish every Member of this body could have been the film I showed a little over a year ago in the Senate Auditorium. The movie told the story of some of the children in South Vietnam, the innocent victims of war who desperately need our help. The photographs of youngsters unable to close their eyes, without ears or limbs or with large portions of facial tissue destroyed due to noma, the disease that attacks malnourished children, were gruesome to look at. And they linger in the mind, long after the film is over. The outstanding work the center accomplishes gives us some ray of hope—some channel for the expression of something positive, something constructive.

In 1967, Arthur J. Barsky, M.D. and Thomas R. Miller established Children's Medical Relief International, a nonprofit New York based agency. In 1968, in cooperation with the South Vietnamese medical community, they founded the center to care for Vietnamese civilians. At first, patients were seen in an apartment building in Saigon, but with the dedication of the new, modern structure in 1969, full scale operation of the hospital began. During the first year 400 children were served. Today the center treats more than 1200 children annually and has already taken care of nearly 5,000 patients. The average patient's age is 8.

Rather than give a more technical description, let me quote from a letter Tom Miller received from American plastic surgeon, Richard Dakin, who served there:

Nothing in my training prepared me for the shock of my first visit to the center for plastic and reconstructive surgery. It's like going to the pound, where the puppies cluster around the visitors, playful but shy, and very appealing in their attempts to be chosen—but these puppies are really children and they are asking, they are really asking, for operations. Then one notices that eyes and noses and ears and cheeks are missing. And one sees the incredible burn contractures, heels fused to buttocks, and ears plastered down into shoulders, and fingers locked back onto little wrists. Keloids are part of nearly every burn injury, and mountains of scar tissue cascade from forehead to chin to breast bone and across brown bellies. Old skin graft donor sites look like deep burns that had never been grafted.

They are so confident that the surgeons can help them, and their quiet brown eyes follow us as we make rounds. And I wish that

I had memorized every text book I had ever read and could repeat flawlessly everything my teachers had ever shown me.

Burns are a major problem in Vietnam, not only from the war but from war-related causes. Yet, in all of South Vietnam there is no adequate burn treatment facility. The Ministry of Health has repeatedly and urgently requested Children's Medical Relief International to help it establish a burn treatment facility. Even now, in spite of the fact that the center is not equipped to treat severe fresh burns, the present medical emergency has forced it to accept many fresh burn cases, forcing it to discontinue its other important work. Construction of a burns facility could begin immediately and be completed in 9 to 12 months. Badly needed burn treatment equipment could be ordered and used immediately.

I am sure most of us saw the pathetic photograph that was plastered on nearly every front page across the Nation of a little girl caught in a raid of South Vietnamese planes that missed their targets and mistakenly dropped flaming napalm on civilians on their own soldiers. The picture showed the girl who had ripped off her burning clothes and with others in the village fled down the road in terror. Ten-year-old Samkin Toc will live to remember that awful day. In fact, her third degree burns and serious complications were treated at the center. But with all her suffering, Samkin Toc was still one of the lucky ones who at least got treatment—and a chance to survive.

I do not believe that concern for these unfortunate children is any matter for debate among men of compassion. CMRI deserves our support because it is an organization bent on repairing, rebuilding, and healing—on the activities man performs when he is really most human.

I strongly urge the Senate to give my amendment its strong support. We decided we should not be fighting there. Now we must realize our responsibility to help pick up the broken pieces of so many innocent lives.

Mr. President, I would like to add that this amendment is in the House version of the Foreign Assistance Act. Accepting this addition to the Senate version of the bill will be an aid in eliminating any unnecessary differences between the House and the Senate versions of the bill.

The amendment contains similar language to what was in the House bill. It would earmark \$712,000 for the Center for Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery in Saigon. It is language that was contained in the last Senate foreign aid bill. The bill itself was defeated. This is language in the House bill at present and would earmark these funds for that center.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Minnesota, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, we are advised and I say this because it is essential to make this very clear to the Senate as the basis on which the minority side at least with the permission of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) would take the amendment, that this amendment was adopted by the Senate in a foreign aid bill which never became law here recently. It is to be understood that if we adopt this provision in the Senate this afternoon, as it is exactly identical with the one in the House bill, there will be no opportunity to change it in conference; but on the representation, one, that we did adopt it before and, two, that the situation relating to the authorization remains the same, I would be prepared, if the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) is willing, to take it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would be agreeable to taking it to conference. I recall that Joe McCaffery, at 6:30 this morning, referred to this as being proxy voting on the part of the Senate, however. But I would be willing to take it. But it is risky business, accepting an amendment that we have seen only 2 seconds before we have to vote on it.

Mr. CHILES. It would not be necessary to take this to conference because it would be identical language which is now in the House bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I have just said that. It is for that reason that I have spelled out the understanding, one, that it has been in a previous bill which did not become law here recently, which is represented to us by our own staff and, two, that the situation remains the same. If there is any problem about it, I am sure that the Senator from Florida is a man of good faith and we will find ways to do something about it. But on those assurances which I gather we get from the Senator from Florida, I would be willing to take the amendment. Do I understand correctly those assumptions?

Mr. CHILES. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of my time. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on this amendment has now been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 578

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 578.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 7, line 10, strike out "SHARING OF COSTS." and insert in lieu thereof "COST-SHARING AND FUNDING LIMITS.—(a)".

On page 7, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(b) No assistance shall be disbursed by the United States Government under sections 103-107 of this Act for a project, for a period exceeding thirty-six consecutive months, with efforts being made before, during, and after such period, to obtain sources of financing within that country and from other foreign countries and multilateral organizations.

"(c) No amounts made available under this Act shall be obligated for any follow-on project which links that project with any other project."

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, the thrust of the bill before the Senate is that, after all the years since World War II, we are going to try to change the direction of our AID program; that we are going to realize that we have reached a point at which we no longer should blindly follow the practice that perhaps made sense at the end of World War II, when the United States had all the dollars and only the United States had the capacity of a developed country to be able to produce and to look after its neighbors; but that we are in changing times and are no longer the biggest guy on the block, who has all the money or all the military potential; that we feel that we have a responsibility to continue to try to help those countries less fortunate to help them reach their destiny and become more developed; that that is in our national interest. That, as I understand it, is the thrust of the bill being managed by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

This amendment actually goes to that thrust, because the amendment would also require that capital projects that we are going into under our AID proposals would not string out over many, many years and would not be financing huge capital projects, but would be more in the nature of trigger money or start-up money, or money that would be used for planning and to find other sources of capital and to bring them into being, so that they would start the engine for development.

It would recognize that under our program of technical aid, we would not be trying to finance huge capital projects under this program and continue over years and years. So this amendment would place a limit on the number of years that AID could finance a project.

I propose an amendment to the foreign aid bill for a 3-year phaseout of each AID loan. I feel that it is essential to have some mechanism in our AID legislation which will insure that the AID policy of the United States is to stimulate the efforts of others rather than to do it ourselves. Our policy should be to elicit financing by national institutions and other development agencies rather than be a source of financing.

My amendment limits the disbursement period for AID financing to 3 years. This would permit the Agency to plan, advise, negotiate, open bids, and conclude contracts before or after the 36 months of disbursement. So the AID Agency would be able to have a 10-year

sectoral loan program with a country in education, for example, in which a continuing working relationship could be established and in which technical assistance, planning, and advisory work could be done. But the financial role of the Agency in any given project would be limited to 3 years. This would make the Agency's essential effort in the financial field one of looking for and stimulating other internal and external sources of financing. AID money would become one of several means of stimulating effort by others rather than a source of complete financing itself. This time limit on AID's financial role in any given project would end foreign aid as a giveaway. This is what the American people want.

The other proposal I have made is to eliminate follow-on loans. These are loans which are made to complete a project started by a previous loan.

An example of a follow-on project which we recently came across in our Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee occurred in Afghanistan, where AID financed a powerhouse project. It is no good if you have a new generator with no transmission lines. The United States tried to get others to finance the transmission lines but ended up being the lender of last resort and financing the transmission facilities itself. This is clearly the kind of thing that is open to criticism for being a giveaway, with no end in sight.

That is why, in the second phase of the amendment, we are trying to strike the followup projects after a project has been entered into. In that way, Congress and the people responsible for okaying the project would understand that this is what we are talking about. We are not talking about a loan of \$2 million that is going to grow into \$15 million because of the follow-on projects that will have to be taken on after the first one unless we have a prohibition such as this.

I am hopeful that these kinds of ideas can provide a means by which the American public can feel that they are reaching out to people in poor countries abroad but that they are not being taken to the cleaners in the process. If the public feels that its interests and instincts are being expressed in legislation and in AID policy, then I think we may have a more politically sustainable AID posture for the United States.

At this time we see that we have a posture of aid that lacks a constituency, because the American people have the idea that too many times it has been a giveaway project, that we have supported what might be good projects, but there is no cutoff period and no end to good projects, and there is no end to being able to select and sort out those projects.

So I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I know that the objective of the distinguished Senator from Florida in offering this amendment is the very best, and I certainly do not question that in any way, in finding some fault with his amendment.

Needless to say, this proposal would make a basic and fundamental change in the concept of our whole aid program. If the proposal has merit—and it may have merit—it seems to me that it is the kind of basic departure that ought to be carefully considered with an opportunity to hear from the administration.

It is my impression that there is nothing magic about 3 years. Indeed, I see no particular relation between 3 years and the goals of our foreign assistance program.

If it is the purpose of this amendment to bring other nations into the effort to help underdeveloped countries, I might say that 16 other nations are already actively engaged in that effort. In fact, some of them, in terms of their gross national product, are doing a better job than the United States.

I hope the Senate will not adopt an amendment such as this.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I was interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I would like him to know that I did present this proposal to the committee. I did testify before the committee in June. That testimony was certainly available in the record to the AID people as well as to the committee itself.

With respect to the arbitrary figure of 3 years, it is interesting to note that perhaps some other figure could be used, but right now the average of aid is over, perhaps, 5 years. This year we are getting ready to disburse a payment under a loan of a commitment made in 1961 to Argentina. This year we are going to make a payment of \$7.5 million. The interest on that loan that Argentina will be paying is three-quarters of 1 percent. Senators can see why we should have some time period.

It seems to me that this is one of the best reasons I can think of. Someone in the United States today who wants to buy a home has to pay 9-percent interest, and yet we are making a loan where we made a commitment in 1961 to Argentina; the loan was for \$7.5 million and bears interest at three-fourths of 1 percent.

I do not see any rhyme or reason to say we should not have a policy such as this. It seems to me that in this bill we are trying to change the direction of aid, and trying to encourage loans to be made where they will help people, and not just build great highways and dams. I thought we were changing the thrust of the bill, according to the Senator from Minnesota, to have people-oriented projects. If we are going to have people-oriented projects then we are talking more about technical assistance and people programs. We are not going to be talking about capital projects, and any capital projects we are in the funds should be disbursed in 3 years.

For that reason I do not think the amendment is arbitrary and I think it would be beneficial to the program.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHILES. I yield.

Mr. INOUE. Does the Senator's amendment affect the International Finance Institution?

Mr. CHILES. No.

Mr. INOUE. Would it affect the military assistance program?

Mr. CHILES. No.

Mr. INOUE. In other words, it affects only development loans.

Mr. CHILES. It affects only development loans, capital projects, so it would not affect technical assistance. It would affect capital projects under development loans.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I think the amendment is worthy of our serious consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I share the concern expressed by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Michigan about this amendment because it is very restrictive.

We must remember that some projects take many years, and we do not want to get into a situation where money is force fed and has to be forced out in a lot less years than it should be in an intelligent and orderly development in a developing country.

Second, the injunction that other sources of financing are to be sought before, during, and after is impractical. We know that once a project is undertaken its financing has to be provided for. We are talking about bailouts and sales after the fact.

This imposes obligations which cannot be assumed in good faith because they cannot be performed in business terms, whether public or private.

I think the fundamental thrust and purpose of the proposal of the Senator from Florida is to see projects financed so far as possible on the local level or from an international financing agency. I am sympathetic to that.

My opinion would be that because the objective is desirable, if the proponent of the amendment would be willing to modify it to make it practical, or if it were understood we will try to make it practical when we take it to conference, and we are not locked into it as it is—again, as an interesting idea and we are always interested in trying to develop interesting ideas—the managers of the bill might consider it desirable to take it to conference with that understanding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to state that the Senator from Florida was very proper about the amendment. He came before the committee to discuss this proposal. It is not something that has been brought up at the last minute. I believe most members of the committee felt there was considerable merit in what the Senator is trying to do. They found no fault with the principle that some projects should not be continued in this case, but on the contrary, that there should be a time factor connected with financial participation.

I do wish to say, with all respect to the Senator from Florida that, as I have in-

dedicated to him in private conversation. I had some concerns about certain applications of the amendment. For example, in Ethiopia, there is a malaria eradication program, which was of high priority in this body. It already has provided three loans for this program in a country that is very poor, and it is planning a fourth program. This measure would mean that it would be cut off.

There is another instance in Ethiopia in terms of rural development districts. There is a malaria project—and I mention malaria because we did take special action in a foreign aid bill some years ago on this matter—and a 3-year limitation would prevent a successful malaria project. That was started in 1959 and was not completed until the early 1970's. There were problems of finding personnel for that part of the world.

If the Senator will believe me that we will try to work out the matter in conference in a way that will accommodate the general principle that the Senator has, and find a way as best we can to get a cut-off date and at least minimize the so-called follow-on projects, I would be more than happy to consult with him during the conference. That would be the best solution of this matter because I would like to see this embodied in our legislation. I know other Senators feel the same way, as the Senator from Hawaii has indicated.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, this amendment is worthy of our support for two reasons. It would provide all of us the necessary authority for oversight and review. At the present time, because of the unlimited nature of the development loan program, we have very little authority in reviewing programs.

In the case of the malaria eradication program I am certain Congress would be happy every 3 years to extend it, but at least we would have the opportunity to have a look-see. Right now because of the restrictions of time, AID and the State Department have made assurances, they come to us after the assurances have been made, putting us in a position where we have no choice and we have to accept because the commitment has been made by the Government. This way Congress would be a participant in making commitments for the program.

Mr. CHILES. I thank the distinguished Senator from Hawaii. I think he is so right.

As he knows, and as I was saying before, we find now AID is just now going to disburse, \$7.5 million to Argentina because they made a commitment in 1961, even though it is at three-quarters of 1 percent interest. I have strong feelings about lending on something done in 1961 at three-quarters of 1 percent interest when people in Minnesota and Florida are paying 9 percent interest on loans for housing. That is something we have to look at in this country and we have to have some kind of control over it.

I appreciate the Senator from Minnesota's assurances, and on the basis he is talking about, I would be very satisfied to have the amendment go to conference. I would like to hear from him during that

conference to see if we could work something out on the amendment, because I think it is a step in the direction which I am convinced we have to take.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHILES. I yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Is the Senator from Florida saying the U.S. Government is lending money to Argentina at three-quarters of 1 percent,

Mr. CHILES. We are going to disburse some funds this year on a commitment that was made in 1961, an AID loan made in 1961. This year we are going to disburse \$7.5 million, and the interest rate is three-quarters of 1 percent.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. And yet the Government itself—not private borrowers, but the Government itself—has been paying 9 percent to lend money to other countries at three-fourths of 1 percent.

Mr. CHILES. I think the Senator from Virginia puts his finger on it. If we had some kind of time limitation—and that is the thrust of the amendment—then we, as policymakers—and that is what the people want us to be—are going to get some chance to review it. The Senator from Virginia knows we would not agree to make a loan at three-quarters of 1 percent today, and yet we are bound just because we did it that way in 1945 and we are continuing to do it that way.

Now, when we say something about it to the AID people, they say, "Remember, it is like the full faith and credit of the United States being on the line. We made a promise." If at the time we made the promise, these funds could be disbursed only over 36 months, everybody knows we are going to take a look at it again. We might well make that loan today to Argentina, but it certainly should not be at three-fourths of 1 percent.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I shall take this amendment. I compliment him on his amendment and on the detailed analysis of the situation. It is obvious that he put a great deal of time into it.

I want to put into the RECORD some examples of project activities in which there are follow-on activities to accomplish project goals, just so we have, as a matter of record when we go to conference, what we are dealing with.

Mr. CHILES. I would be glad to have that.

I hope the Senator would understand the point made by the Senator from Hawaii—that they would have to come back to Congress and say, "We think this is a good project. We think we should have funds for malaria control in Ethiopia." I have trust that the Congress will say it is a good project. If there were some delays in the project, we would recognize it. We also get a look at the "turkeys," the ones we would not do today because there have been some changes. We ought to have a chance to make a better choice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the Senator, and we ought to have an oversight subcommittee in the Foreign Rela-

tions Committee to take a look at these projects.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me before he takes the amendment?

Will the Senator explain what he means in paragraph (c) where it says:

No amounts made available under this Act shall be obligated for any follow-on project which links that project with any other project?

This not only applies to sections 103 to 107, but to the whole act. That is a pretty broad net.

I am wondering if it might not be more prudent not to carry that into conference, because it is a pretty big one, but to confine ourselves to subsection (b), and then endeavor to work it out as the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Florida have just discussed.

Mr. CHILES. If it would help the Senator's understanding of the amendment, I would be happy to modify it in that way:

No amounts made available under sections 103-107 shall be obligated for any follow-on project which links that project with any other project.

I think this is an important part of the amendment. I would be happy to offer that as a modification.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator explain what he has in mind?

Mr. CHILES. Let me first modify the amendment.

Mr. President, I make the following modification: After the word "under" in the first line of subsection (c), insert "sections 103-107 of".

I send the modification to the desk and ask that the amendment be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, the thrust of this—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend until we get the modification reported?

Mr. CHILES. Certainly.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as modified, as follows:

On page 7, line 10, strike out "SHARING OF COSTS." and insert in lieu thereof "COST-SHARING AND FUNDING LIMITS.—(a)".

On page 7, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(b) No assistance shall be disbursed by the United States Government under sections 103-107 of this Act for a project, for a period exceeding thirty-six consecutive months, with efforts being made before, during and after such period, to obtain sources of financing within that country and from other foreign countries and multilateral organizations."

"(c) No amounts made available under sections 103-107 of this Act shall be obligated for any follow-on project which links that project with any other project."

Mr. CHILES. The thrust of this amendment is to say that when we are getting into a capital project under AID, we are going to know what the price is for that project, and we are not going into a project that starts up as \$2 million and ends up being a project that costs \$25 million with the follow-ons.

In the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropria-

tions, we recently saw a follow-on project for transmission lines in Afghanistan. It seems that some years ago AID made a loan for a generating plant, a power-plant, there, but at the time that loan was made, that was to be the commitment; but now AID has come back and said, "Well, we had to grant this to use for the transmission lines. We granted millions of dollars for the generating plant, and what good is a generating plant or transmission facilities if you do not have any lines?"

That is a pretty logical argument, but we did not know that when we started. When we started it, we were told that was our obligation and the other money was to come from somewhere else.

This amendment is to pin it down and the thrust of it is to say that AID is to provide the startup money, the triggering money, or at least know what we are going to pay for it at the time we get into it, and not get into something that goes on and on and on in followup projects, which has been much of the history of these projects.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me we are locking ourselves in at both ends. The Senator's argument that we ought to take a look every 3 years I can buy. I cannot buy this argument, for the reason that it may be every 6 months or 3 months.

What the Senator is trying to do is protect against our own improvidence. If we are stupid enough to give more money for generators when we have authorized digging a trench, that is our problem. I do not think we can protect against our improvidence without completely hobbling the whole program.

When there is a fixed period of time, as was pointed out by the Senator from Hawaii, in which to take a look at it, I can go along with that, but to absolutely restrict any project I cannot go along with. A malaria control program may require clinics. It does not mean we have to provide them, but it does mean we have to listen to the arguments of people in AID that we should furnish them. We do not have to authorize or appropriate for them.

And we do take a hard look at it periodically. I think this could get another lock on the door which would simply paralyze us. We want this to mean something. Otherwise, why do it at all? I see the substance in the Senator's idea about the year and the fact that we do not commit ourselves for an indefinite time in the future. However, this particular thing presents us with an absolute limitation. Assuming that we are not trying to be improvident, we nevertheless put shackles on our hands respecting the kind of project we can finance, and we define what is in the project and what is a follow-on project. It is almost impossible to do. It will become involved in litigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, has the time expired on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that I have made my point. I would like to know what answer there is to the point I have made.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, if again there is a concern on the part of the distinguished Senator from New York that this would limit the Congress from looking at a follow-on project, then I would think he has a valid point. And if we wanted to so modify the amendment to say:

No amounts made available under this act shall be obligated for any follow-on project which links that project with any other project without congressional authorization.

Then I would be happy to offer that as a modification. That is the thrust of the amendment. The Senator from New York says that we do not want to tie our hands. However, at the same time we want to be put on notice that if we are going to the well again, if this is going to be one add-on after another add-on, if we are going further, they ought to come back to us and not have the agency decide that we have committed ourselves to this and now they have to go forward. They will decide that this is the word of the United States. We might start off and say that there will be a few million dollars in the project and it will then go to \$200 million, then at least we would get another look at it.

Mr. JAVITS. Suppose that the agency's counsel makes a recommendation. I do not know what it would be. We have not made any commitment for a project. It might be to put up poles without wires. It is not linked to any other project, and that is it. I do not know what the Senator is protecting us against by adding this provision except a possible legal complexity which would enable someone to start a suit and say that something is illegal.

That is what I am arguing. We would be locked in.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, the Senator is trying to protect a word of art that the AID people come up with when they come before one of the committees and say, "We are putting in for a transmission line in Afghanistan."

We ask why. And they say, "This is a follow-on project. We built the power source, and no one will build the power line. Now we are going to build the power line." They will probably come back and say, "We need telephones." It is a word of art developed by the AID people themselves. I think it does have a connotation for the word "art." And it simply requires that Congress have another look at it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does the Senator want to modify his amendment and add the words "without any congressional approval"?

Mr. CHILES. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President. I think that will cover the subject.

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment, on page 2, on line 3, after the word "project," strike the period and add the words "without any congressional authorization."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, all time on this side is yielded back.

Mr. CHILES. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with and that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 17 strike out, lines 4 through 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 13, Section (37(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorizations is amended to read as follows: "(a) All administrative expenses incurred during fiscal years 1974 and 1975 by the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of this Act shall be paid out of amounts made available under such part I."

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, last year, when the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Foreign Assistance, reported to the Senate the foreign assistance and related programs appropriation bill for fiscal year 1973, there was a chapter beginning on page 26 of the report entitled "Problems of Foreign Assistance Programs as Presently Constituted." The third, fourth, and fifth paragraphs read as follows:

The committee points out problems relating to the appropriations account covering the Agency for International Development's Administrative Expenses. This appropriation was originally intended to monitor and control those funds appropriated for foreign assistance which were being used to "administer" the program; however, it is no longer an accurate or even useful yardstick for this purpose. For example, in fiscal year 1972, when the authorization for administrative expenses was reduced from \$60,200,000 to \$50,000,000, one of the agencies responses was to transfer 324 personnel, previously funded from the administrative expenses appropriation, to the program account appropriations. Secondly, \$5,355,000 in fiscal year 1972 costs of the January 1971 pay raises (which were considered and rejected by the conferees on the fiscal year 1972 authorization bill—see page 18, Senate Report 92-763) were obtained by transfer from 1972 funds previously appropriated as Development Loans. Finally, the President transferred an additional \$3,600,000 to this account for "Expanded Vietnam Support Costs."

It is also a matter of concern to the committee that the Development Assistant Committee of the Organization of Economic Community Development has elected not to count funds for "administrative expenses" in its computation of U.S. foreign assistance.

For these and other reasons the committee feels that separate appropriation of Administrative Expenses has outlived its usefulness and recommends that consideration be given to its elimination as an individual appropriation. This would permit "administrative" costs to be borne by and assessed against the several operating programs of the Agency

for International Development as has often come to be the case through administrative determination.

Mr. President, my amendment would achieve the purposes set forth in the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee when it reported the foreign assistance appropriation bill last year. It will amend the Foreign Assistance Act by eliminating the authorization for "administrative expenses."

At the present time, the operating expenses for the Agency for International Development are funded from two primary sources, the AID administrative expense appropriation, and from major program appropriations.

For fiscal year 1972 the total administrative expenses for AID were \$203,939,000, and \$58,628,000 of that amount was appropriated under the administrative expense authorization. The balance was derived from the major program appropriations such as worldwide development grants, population programs, alliance development grants and others.

I ask unanimous consent to have in the RECORD, following my remarks, a table which will reflect the funding for AID administrative expenses for the past 3 fiscal years. It will also show which of these administrative expenses were incurred in Washington and which were incurred at overseas headquarters posts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I am proposing this amendment for two reasons:

First, the administrative expenses appropriation does not accurately reflect or limit the amounts necessary to run the Agency programs. If it did, it would be a useful and meaningful budgetary device. However, as it stands now, that title is a hollow and misleading one that has no real meaning or justification. Second, by requiring the Agency for International Development to prorate their administrative expenses among their programs, by requiring the Agency for International Development to prorate their administrative expense authorization, we will be reducing the total authorization by that amount. In fiscal year 1973, \$57,159,000 was appropriated for administrative expenses and the budget request for fiscal year 1974 is \$57,875,000. The committee has allowed \$49 million.

Mr. President, I believe this \$49 million ought to be absorbed within the various major programs administered by AID, and I urge the adoption of my amendment. It will mean a savings to the taxpayers of \$49 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me say that I understand the desire of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD). I am also aware that we had a discussion in the Committee on Appropriations. I would hate to see this happen for the coming fiscal year. My suggestion to the Senator from West Virginia is that if he would divide his proposal in half—in other words, require the agency to take half of the \$50 from program funds. That is, a \$24 million reduction from the \$49 million—bringing it down to \$25 million. In other

words, the administrative expenses provided for in 1974 would be \$24 million.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. If the Senator would switch the figures, we would call it a deal. The Senator is getting the better share of the bargain. I would hope the Senator would make a reduction of \$25 million, leaving \$24 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I intended I sought to leave \$24 million as the amount for administrative expenses. \$25 million would be taken from program funds.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I accordingly modify my amendment, because this would be a great step in the direction in which the Appropriations Committee has recommended that we move.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that the Senator has discussed the matter with the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I have.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I, too, have discussed it with him. We think the proposal is satisfactory.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I think the Senator understands my intent in offering the amendment, as do the managers of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be so modified.

EXHIBIT 1

Operating expenses are funded from two primary sources: A.I.D. Administrative Expenses and the major program appropriations such as Development Grants, Supporting Assistance, Population, etc. In addition, non-appropriated funds available to the Agency—for the housing investment guaranty and excess property programs—and foreign currency Trust Funds contributed by host countries are used to meet such costs. The table below shows the amounts funded from each source for FY 1972-FY 1974.

FUNDING OF OPERATING EXPENSES

[In thousands of dollars]

	1972	1973	1974
APPROPRIATED FUNDS			
AID administrative expenses.....	58,628	57,159	57,875
Worldwide development grants.....	62,079	61,070	56,910
Alliance development grants.....	15,408	15,197	14,035
Population programs.....	2,414	4,006	5,873
Refugee relief and rehabilitation assistance (Bangladesh).....	112	520	-----
American schools and hospitals abroad.....	141	219	225
Supporting assistance.....	33,961	31,804	5,230
Indochina reconstruction assistance.....	-----	-----	27,248
Total appropriated funds.....	172,743	169,975	167,396
OTHER FUNDS			
Housing guaranty fund.....	702	900	1,060
Excess property fund.....	487	447	421
Host country local currency contributions.....	30,007	29,887	22,242
Total.....	203,939	201,207	191,119
	1972 actual	1973 estimated	1974 estimated
Total AID operating expenses:			
Overseas.....	118,991	116,591	104,694
Washington.....	84,948	84,618	86,425
Total.....	203,939	201,207	191,119

Mr. HUMPHREY. We yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk

inquires, how is the amendment to be modified?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is very simple. Let me help the clerk.

The bill provides for \$49 million for administrative expenses. This amendment says there will be \$24 million for administrative expenses and \$25 million will be taken out of program funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands, if the clerk does.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the figure "\$49 million" appearing on line 8 page 17 be stricken and that in lieu thereof the figure "\$24 million" be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And it is understood that the other \$25 million will come from program funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time yielded back on the amendment?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUDDLESTON). All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland wanted to pose a question. I yield him 2 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding just for a brief question, which I think will be helpful in clarifying one of the features of the bill which has been brought into doubt, under the area found on page 10 of the bill relating to housing guarantees.

Mr. President, according to the committee report, as I read it, the state of Israel was receiving \$50 million a year in guaranteed loans in fiscal year 1973 and fiscal year 1974. Given the desperate housing conditions which exist in Israel, and both the needs and the ability of the Israelis to use such loans effectively, I would hope that the administration would continue these loans in fiscal year 1975 at the same rate.

Incidentally, I am advised that Israel itself is spending some \$400 million a year for new housing.

Since there is some question about this, and since I think specifically the state of Israel is not certain at this time whether the administration will actually make these loans available at the same level for the rest of fiscal year 1974 and prospectively in fiscal year 1975, I am wondering if the Senator would state what the committee's position is, and whether I am correct in my assumption that it is the intent of Congress, and certainly the will of the Senate, that this program be continued.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, absolutely. This program was discussed fully in committee. I do not think there is the shadow of a doubt that the program is to be continued.

We did review very carefully these program loans and guarantees in housing, and took into consideration, by the way, of course, the views of the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr.

SPARKMAN), who is obviously involved in all matters relating to housing.

It is the view of the committee that the administration should continue at the level that is in this bill.

Mr. MATHIAS. I had contemplated the possibility that an amendment might be appropriate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is not necessary. Mr. MATHIAS. But I think if it is the very clear understanding of the Senate that this is what is intended by this bill, that should suffice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the bill speaks specifically to this point. There is no doubt what the intent is: namely, that the level shall continue and not be modified, that is, into a lesser degree.

Mr. MATHIAS. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 577

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 577, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Beginning on page 30, line 3, strike all to end of bill.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the amendment has been modified to read as follows:

Beginning on page 30, line 3, strike all to and including line 13 on page 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I am sympathetic to the intent of this section of the bill, but I believe that this is the wrong approach to correcting a serious problem.

This section would provide, if it became law, that if, after a demand for information in writing was made by either the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate or the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the committee did not receive the information from the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, ACTION, or the Overseas Private Investment Corp., funds for the particular department, agency, or corporation would be cut off.

I happen to agree that it is most important that Congress receive the information that it needs, both for legislative purposes as well as for purposes of oversight. However, I think this is the wrong solution.

I would like to point out that this is not a partisan issue. In 1967, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I had problems in getting information I thought I was entitled to as a Member of the House of Representatives. It took me something like 18 months to even identify the hundreds of Federal domestic assistance programs, and I might say that as a member of the panel that has been looking into executive privilege and related problems on the Senate side, I strongly agree that this administration, too, has not been supplying the information that we need.

The thing that concerns me is that the cure is almost as bad as the bite. It seems to me wrong to provide that funds will be

cut off for an entire program because, in essence, what we are saying is that those who are intended to benefit from the program will suffer because someone in the executive branch refuses that information.

I think it is also wrong because it would mean that the families of those persons working for that department would also have their compensation cut off. This seems to me an overreaching of power on the part of Congress.

I might point out that secondly, it seems to me that this section, if it became law, in effect could cut both ways, and I do not think it is desirable from either standpoint. What it provided is that a committee, by demanding certain information, can in effect kill a program, and there is no limit as to what kind of information could be demanded.

I think that it is wrong that any committee be given the power to defeat a program that has been enacted by both the House of Representatives and the Senate. It seems to me that if any such action were to be taken, it should be the action of Congress as a whole, rather than merely one committee.

But I point out, to those who are supporting this legislation, that it could cut from the other standpoint as well. It would be very simple for a President who did not like a particular program to refuse such information, and thereby kill the program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ROTH. Finally, I would like to point out that it seems that we learn nothing from history. This legislation places no limit, except that there is some provision with respect to executive privilege. Beyond that, it provides no limit as to the kind of information that can be demanded.

I think if we go back in the days of the 1950's, we will recall there was a committee that became infamous throughout this land for its unreasonable demands. That could happen again in the future. I would just say that the committee could demand information for which it really has no need. As the New York Times in 1954 said:

The Congress is not entitled to every scrap of information and every piece of paper in the executive branch.

For that reason, I think this legislation is unsound in that it has no limitation.

More important than anything else, I would like to point out that the Government Operations Committee is working on this very serious problem. It is a problem not only with our foreign policy agencies, but with several other agencies, and I am very hopeful that before the year is out we will report to this floor a bill that will provide a sound means of insuring that each legislative committee has the information to which it is entitled.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for telling us again what the Government Operations Committee is directing its attention toward. That is where we feel we will find a resolution of the problem on information.

Now with the approval of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, I understand that this language has been agreed on between the two Houses, so that it would be acceptable.

So I might send it to the desk and ask that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would not be in order until all time has been yielded back on the pending amendment, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in that manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified—

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. Would the clerk please state the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Beginning on page 30, line 3, strike out all down through line 13 on page 31 and insert the following:

"Sec. 22. Subsection 634(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2394 (c)) is amended—

(1) by striking out (1); and
(2) by striking out all after the phrase so requested and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: 'The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to any communication that is directed by the President to a particular officer or employee of the United States Government or to any communication that is directed by any such officer or employee to the President.'

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, that is the language that is in the original bill at present, but I wanted it clear that we would be striking all the language from page 30 down through the line on page 31, line 2.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Minnesota that, of course, it is an improvement in the sense that it deletes several of the agencies to which it would otherwise apply. I ask this question: It is my understanding, then, that essentially what this does is to have it apply only to the—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Foreign assistance—

Mr. ROTH [continuing]. Agencies. The Agency for International Development? Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. We thought in this legislation that we should relate the amendment to the particular activities of this particular agency.

Mr. ROTH. I would say to the Senator from Minnesota that I personally could not support the amendment. I will not ask for a rollcall vote. I disagree with the language in principle. It is the wrong way to correct what I consider to be a serious problem. But I realize from earlier votes that I cannot eliminate it entirely so I will not ask for a record vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the amendment I presented to the desk, is it not, on which we will now be voting?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY obtained the floor.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am happy now to yield to the assistant majority leader.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the Senator for yielding without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. President, I am authorized by the distinguished majority leader—this matter having been cleared on both sides of the aisle, and having been cleared with Senators COTTON, MAGNUSON, YOUNG, McCLELLAN, and other Senators, and the leadership on the other side of the aisle—to propound the following unanimous-consent requests:

That, on tomorrow, immediately after any orders for the recognition of Senators and any routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the continuing resolution for 1974, House Joint Resolution 727.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Labor and HEW appropriation bill H.R. 8877.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether the report of the committee and the proposal are both available to Senators?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The committee report is being filed today.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow afternoon—depending, of course, on the circumstances and the time of day when the continuing resolution shall have been disposed of—for the leadership to call up S. 2385, the amateur athletic bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois for yielding me this time.

AMENDMENT NO. 574

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 574 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 9, line 11, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 9, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"SEC. 116. INTEGRATING WOMEN INTO NATIONAL ECONOMIES.—Sections 103-107 shall be administered so as to give particular attention to those programs, projects, and activities which tend to integrate women into the national economies of foreign countries, thus improving their status and assisting the total development effort."

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I believe that we can dispose of this amendment, important as it is, in just a few minutes. Let me make these comments.

It is well known that in many of the lesser developed countries, traditional practices, cultural mores, and inadequate resources tend to block women and girls from access to educational and economic opportunities.

In developed countries as well, including the United States, women and girls suffer similar—if less severe—discrimination. I am very conscious of this, and I continue to support every reasonable effort to give women and girls full equality in our society.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has been especially concerned with the problems of women in the aid-recipient countries. In the committee report on this year's foreign assistance bill, S. 2335, the following language appears:

Recognizing that the status of women within each society is one of the indicators of the level of national development, U.S. bilateral aid should assist in the integration of women into the national economy.

This is an important concept and a significant statement which I now wish to bring into law by means of an amendment to the foreign assistance bill.

My amendment specifies that the major provisions of the act "shall be administered so as to give particular attention to programs, projects, and activities which tend to integrate women into the national economies of foreign countries, thus improving their status and assisting the total development effort."

At the same time as we seek to achieve the equal rights of women in our own country, let us adopt this amendment to promote the achievement of equal rights for women in the aid-recipient countries.

Mr. President, I trust that the managers of the bill will, in their wisdom, consider this a desirable objective and will accept the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the amendment is surely acceptable. I have discussed it with the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and we are more than happy to take it.

Mr. President, I yield back whatever time remains to me on this amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has now been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment No. 574 of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY).

The amendment was agreed to.

INTRODUCTION OF S. 2521, AS AN AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT TO PROVIDE DISASTER RELIEF TO THE DROUGHT-STRICKEN SAHEL, TO RELIEVE THE FLOOD DAMAGE IN PAKISTAN AND PROVIDE RECONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE TO NICARAGUA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was my intention to yield on the bill all time that we have to call up an amendment

to add a new section to the bill for disaster relief. This is very much in order, particularly in countries like Pakistan and Nicaragua and other countries in West Africa in areas where there is serious trouble and great distress. But the amendment would call for an additional sum of money to the bill.

I have been a bit critical of those who have presented amendments here without hearings or without calling them to the attention of the committee—and I say this without referring to anyone who may be in the Chamber at this moment—but it would be much better in light of the fact that the sum of money here that I have been seeking would be approximately \$150 million, that this amendment go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and I would hope that we could have hearings on it, because I know that the administration is deeply concerned over some of the needs in these disaster areas, where there is great suffering from floods, earthquakes, and drought. Therefore, I am not going to call up my amendment, but I will send it to the desk and ask unanimous consent that it be referred, as a bill, to the Committee on Foreign Relations, on behalf of myself, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator JACKSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

FUNDING FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last year we all were deeply concerned about the severe damage caused by an earthquake in Nicaragua. During the last few months, we have been shocked to learn of the catastrophic effects of a widespread, prolonged drought in West Africa. In just the last few weeks, we have been appalled by the devastation caused by floods in Pakistan.

The United States—both its Government and its private citizens—has responded promptly and generously to each of these disasters.

But the needs in each case go beyond the provision of food and other emergency relief. These unfortunate people must be given the wherewithal to rehabilitate themselves and begin again the task of development. The economic assistance funds already included in this bill are badly needed to implement the new development purposes outlined in the policy section. If we are to meet our important humanitarian obligation in the three unfortunate areas, additional funds must be authorized for this purpose. It is for this reason that I have introduced an amendment to authorize \$150 million, of which \$95 million would be for Pakistan flood recuperation, \$40 million for the African Sahel drought area, and \$15 million for Nicaragua earthquake reconstruction.

The needs are tremendous in each case. In Nicaragua, the reconstruction problems now facing the people of Managua are staggering. The earthquake which struck on December 23, 1972 killed some 10,000 people and injured 20,000. It was followed by 6 days of fires which swept through the still standing buildings in the city area. When the catastrophe was over half the population of Managua had lost their homes and two-thirds were refugees. Only one-fifth of the city had escaped significant dam-

age; and one-third was completely destroyed. Most of the government offices had been rendered unusable. Four entire hospitals had been destroyed and 65 percent of Managua's classrooms were lost. Total damage to physical assets was estimated at over \$300 million.

The international donor community rushed relief assistance to the people of Managua. Sixty-three countries, a number of voluntary agencies, the U.N., and the OAS all contributed food, emergency shelter, medicine, and field hospitals. AID contributed \$12.5 million in disaster relief.

Now Managua must be rebuilt—at a cost far greater than the estimated damages. The hospitals, schools, and government buildings must be replaced. New homes must be built for the refugees—under higher construction standards and less crowded conditions so that this catastrophe will not repeat itself. Public services and utilities—water, electricity, streets—must be provided for Managua and the nearby cities where much of Managua's population is now living.

There is an urgent need for \$15 million in fiscal year 1974 for AID to assist in rebuilding Managua and its economy. The first priority will be to provide assistance to the least fortunate victims of this disaster—to build low-cost housing and provide services for the thousands of poor Nicaraguans who lost what little they had in the earthquake.

The floods which swept Pakistan in late August and early September devastated more than 3 million acres of its most productive agricultural land. More than 400 people have died. About 10 million people were dislocated, with 1 million homes lost or damaged and perhaps 1 million tons of stored grain lost. The tragedy came just as Pakistan was completing a record wheat harvest and was beginning to register significant economic progress in the aftermath of the war with India and the loss of East Pakistan. The Pakistan Government considers the flood to be the worst natural disaster in its history.

The flood did tremendous damage not only to the current crop but also to the irrigation system, the roads, the railways, and in some cases the land on which agricultural production depends. It will cost the Pakistan Government at least \$75 million to restore these facilities and an additional \$100 million to rebuild schools, health and other public facilities.

Seed, fertilizer, and other agricultural inputs will be needed to assure maximum production in the next year.

Because the flood cost Pakistan \$400 million in foreign exchange earnings, general balance-of-payments assistance will be necessary to assure the country can purchase needed products from abroad.

The United States has already contributed \$42 million of the \$59 million provided by the international community for disaster relief in Pakistan. The task now is to rebuild the devastated economy.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee, I have followed closely report of the disastrous drought in West Africa. I am particularly concerned that the United States con-

tinue to play an active role in the relief and recovery of this area.

The people in six West African states—Mauritania, Mali, Chad, Upper Volta, Niger, and Senegal—are suffering one of the worst natural disasters in history.

The United States must act now to assure that food reaches these people threatened by famine and to begin projects which will eventually enable them to again feed themselves. Without massive food assistance and adequate distribution facilities, millions will die of starvation in the next year. Without assistance in substantially increasing the productivity of this area and pushing back the steadily encroaching desert, the suffering and threat of famine will continue indefinitely. The United States, in cooperation with the rest of the international donor community, can easily prevent famine, alleviate suffering, and provide some hope for the people of the Sahel.

Four years of drought have devastated the area known as the Sahel. Thousands have died of starvation and disease. Millions have lost their means of support—and their way of life. Their herds are dead. Their wells are dry. Their farms and pasturelands have been claimed by the Sahara Desert.

Today, millions of nomadic herdsmen and farmers are clustered around cities, waiting for the meager rations of food and water that will keep them alive. They are weakened and vulnerable to disease. The margins of survival are extremely thin. The only thing certain about their future is that the suffering will continue—and the threat of famine will become greater.

For again this year the rains did not come in many of these states. Again, many farmers saw their seed bake in the ground. Many of them had no seed to plant, or were away from their farms in search of food, or had seen the desert take over what was once their farmland. The harvests that are due in the next 3 months will be smaller than ever. They can do little to alleviate the hunger.

The grain reserves are totally depleted.

As much as 80 percent of the herds that fed the nomads are dead. Those that remain are threatened by starvation, disease, and lack of water.

To avoid famine in the coming year, the international donor community must be willing to provide even more emergency relief than was necessary last year.

The relief supplied last year was barely enough to keep those who could reach the distribution centers alive. It is impossible to estimate how many died trying to reach these centers or in isolated villages, but most agree that deaths from starvation or disease were in the hundreds of thousands.

Last year, the international donor community contributed 624,000 tons of grain and \$38,550,000 in cash. Of this, the United States contributed 256,000 tons of grain and \$4,400,000. The major problem in the relief effort was inadequate transportation facilities. Food piled up at ports waiting to be shipped inland. The United States contributed three C-130's to carry food to distribution centers inaccessible by road or railroad. But

many of the villages were never reached; and for many in the distribution centers, the food arrived too late.

Because the reserves are gone that enabled people to survive while they waited for food shipments last year, the transportation bottlenecks that developed cannot be allowed to recur. Grain must be shipped now and stored where it will be needed. This will require external subsidization of trucking, road repair and storage—as well as a continuing steady flow of grain shipments.

The African states are doing everything possible to meet this catastrophe internally. But it must be remembered that these are some of the poorest states in the world. Mali, for example, had a per capita GNP of \$60 before the drought. The tax base in these countries has been destroyed. They cannot tax farmers who have lost their farms or herdsmen whose cattle are dead. Their traditional export crops diminished, they are earning very little foreign exchange. Without subsidization from the European Economic Community, these governments would not have been able to function in the last year.

The lives of 25 million people in the Sahel are therefore in the hands of the international donor community. U.S. assistance in the past year has made the difference between life and death for millions. We can be proud of the role the United States has played, not only in providing direct assistance, but also in encouraging other nations to participate and in coordinating the international relief effort. We cannot now relax our efforts to avoid famine in the Sahel, when the peak of the crisis is still to come.

Maurice Williams, the President's special coordinator for drought relief, has stated, "Merely keeping people alive is not enough." Because the people of the Sahel are malnourished and vulnerable to disease, subsistence-level food supplies are not enough to assure their survival. Medicines and nutritional food will have to be provided. The United States is helping set up a nutritional surveillance system in the Sahel. We will have to provide both medicine and high-quality food to prevent the spread of the contagious diseases that have already killed thousands of the victims of the drought.

And, if this disaster is not to continue year after year, projects must be begun now that will enable the people of the Sahel to once again feed themselves.

The first and most critical task is to assure that the harvest a year from now is as large as possible and that breeding herds are kept alive. Water must be provided wherever possible. Farm-to-market roads must be repaired and new ones built. Seed and agricultural inputs must be provided. The remaining herds must be fed and inoculated against disease. And those farmers who will be able to plant crops must be taught methods for maximizing their production. Unless these projects are begun immediately, the threat of famine will hang over the Sahel not only next year, but the year after as well. At a time of worldwide food shortage, we cannot afford to let this happen.

But the longer-term task of full recovery

in the Sahel will require much more than the building of roads and wells. The Sahara Desert has claimed much of what was once crop and pasture land and continues to encroach on the little productive land left in these six West African states.

In a recent meeting in Ouagadougou representatives of the African governments and of national and international relief organizations outlined a program for recovery of the land taken over by the desert. This program will have to be carefully reviewed to assure that it solves rather than aggravates the problem of desertification. It will then take years of work and innovation to implement. But the U.S. Government has committed itself to contributing to the full recovery of the Sahel.

We must begin in the next year to apply our research skills, our agricultural technology, and our scientific expertise to pushing back the desert in West Africa. We have considerable experience and research capabilities in semi-arid agriculture. We have expertise in livestock management and water resources development. We can provide tools, seed, and research in crop rotation and livestock improvement.

We have already begun using the Earth Resources Technology Satellite to survey water resources in the Sahel and to work with scientists and agricultural specialists in American universities in helping develop a comprehensive plan for recovery in the Sahel. We must continue and expand these efforts to make the Sahel productive again.

The Sahelian drought is a unique catastrophe. It has not only brought the threat of famine for millions; it has also destroyed the land. If the land is not restored, the threat of famine will continue indefinitely; and the Sahel will become a permanent disaster area.

Yet, if the international community meets the challenge of this catastrophe, it could become a breakthrough in development assistance. For the Sahel is an extreme example of the development problems faced around the world. Agricultural methods are archaic in many less developed countries. In the Sahel, most of the food crops are grown by farmers with wooden hoes.

Agricultural productivity is far below capacity throughout the developing world. The small farmers who produce most of the food and export crops cannot get credit or agricultural inputs, are not reached by farm-to-market roads, are often not receiving adequate water supplies, and receive little or no education, extension or health services. The people of the Sahel, living in some of the poorest countries in the world, are faced with all these problems in an extreme form.

The international donor community has begun to meet the extreme problems of the Sahel with all the scientific knowledge, technology, and agricultural expertise applicable. The United States has promised to use scientists and agricultural experts from our universities in helping to develop a comprehensive recovery plan. The United Nations has begun to collect all the studies that have

This is not intended to prohibit exchanges of information with foreign countries on matters of common interest in fields such as narcotics control, prohibition, hijacking, prevent of terrorist acts or matters of a similar nature.

opment problems of the poor countries. Yet, it is in our national interest to heave this warning—our Nation is neither so rich nor so powerful that we can ignore any country in the world. Other nations may pay the price for our aloofness and lack of concern today. However, it will be the United States who pays the price tomorrow, unless we can demonstrate a little wisdom and foresight rather than succumbing to simple and shortsighted nations of what our role in the world should be.

Mr. President as we begin deliberation of S. 2335, it is important that we cast aside simplistic notions of what our foreign aid efforts around the world should entail and deal with the real problems with which we are trying to find solutions now and in ensuing years.

In this connection, there appeared a timely article in yesterday's Washington Star-News. The article was written by Mr. Richard Critchfield, a former Asian correspondent for the Star-News who is now studying the food and population problems of the third world by living in peasant communities in Asia and Africa.

The importance by Mr. Critchfield's article is that it is based upon his first hand knowledge and experiences. We in the United States, who are not in day-to-day contact with the problems of the developing world, engage in the luxury of maintaining an aloofness when it comes to consideration of these problems. Reality becomes clouded by meaningless and empty rhetoric which is detrimental for a responsible and effective formulation of our policy.

Mr. Critchfield has performed a very invaluable service by explaining the realities of the world situation today, and particularly how our foreign aid effort is directly related to such problems as food production, population control, and self-sufficiency in the developing nations.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOREIGN AID OR FAMINE

(By Richard Critchfield)

What can the individual American do to help the increasingly hungry poor two-thirds of the world in the worsening global food crisis?

Support increased foreign aid. It cannot come too soon. This summer, world grain reserves fell to around 100 million tons, the lowest level in 20 years. Some 200 million Indians, 25 million Africans and possibly 40 million Chinese face hunger, if not famine, before the winter harvest. And Bangladesh, Indonesia and the Philippines will be critically short of rice until December.

Russian grain purchases abroad of 28 million tons, half of it from the United States and altogether almost three times bigger than any food import in history, has created a problem even in the United States. About half of some 50 million acres of United States reserve cropland—much of the rest is marginal—is being put back into production.

Agricultural expert Lester R. Brown of the Overseas Development Council has described it as a "dangerous" situation: "For the first time since the end of World War II, the world is without either of the two important safety valves in the world food economy—surplus stocks of grain and a large reserve of United

States cropland that could readily be brought back into production."

The implication of this for the poor countries, many of them already falling behind in the food-population race, is grave. Their main hope lies in expanding food production through the spread of the new high-yielding dwarf varieties of rice and wheat which, with enough fresh water and nitrogen fertilizer, can double harvests. But country after country lacks the foreign exchange to buy vital inputs.

The forecast then is not for inevitable global famine. It is for famine which can be avoided if the United States and other rich countries give enough foreign aid for fertilizer, insecticides, irrigation works, feeder roads, landlord compensation and family planning. Old "trickle down" development economics are no longer good enough; a way has to be found—and very quickly—to directly fill the cisterns at the bottom.

This will require a wholesale shift in American public opinion. Foreign aid is presently tattering along on well over a year of miserly funding under Congressional continuing resolutions. Congress apparently is in no mood to be generous now. And the former foreign aid lobby, East Coast liberals who used to combine a steady interest in the whole world with an instinct for reform, now seems to have turned its back on all foreign involvements. Aid is bad, they say, because it encourages Vietnam-style intervention and helps the rich not the poor. And besides, economic growth is impossible because it will exhaust the planet's resources, they say.

Such arguments may be silenced quickly once mass starvation becomes a regular evening feature on the American living room TV screen. Americans may be alarmed about this summer's shortage of beef and high food prices. But their average daily intake is still around 3,000 calories of which 40 percent is derived from animal products and 35 percent from cereals, starchy foods and sugar. The average Asian in recent months is getting less than the 2,000 calories he could count on 10 years ago—and 80 percent of what he does get is starch and sugar.

Food increases in the poor countries, remarkable as they have been since the introduction of the new wheat and rice in 1967, simply cannot keep up with the 180,000 babies born each day or the 66 million more mouths to feed each year.

As Theodore Geiger of the National Planning Association and others have predicted, it may not be long before American guilt over Vietnam and disappointment over the results of 21 years of foreign aid may shift dramatically—suddenly we may be blaming past failures on the inadequacy of previous efforts. And past failures are beginning to look not all that serious. United States food aid shipments have dropped sharply the past few years, largely because of the success in transferring modern American farm technology to the poor countries.

But this is not time to lag. The key to continuing increases in food production, in Brown's words, is the "development of water resources and continuation of United States support of the kind which launched the green revolution." In short, more foreign aid.

During the past year in Southeast Asia I have seen concrete example after example of governments frustrated in their attempts to grow more food because of insufficient foreign aid. The Philippines, for instance, is critically short of fertilizer but lacks the foreign exchange to buy it. Nor can it proceed with land reform—on which modernization of its agriculture depends—without \$250 to \$300 million in aid needed over a three-year period for landlord compensation. Split between the United States, Japan and the World Bank, at \$30 million a year apiece this would be a cheap and effective form of aid.

Population control often suffers the same way. The World Bank recently came up with a \$33 million, five-year loan package for family planning in Indonesia geared to handle 1.2 million acceptors. By the time the program was cranked up, successes in East Java and Bali had brought the number of acceptors up close to 2 million but there were no funds for vital follow-up field workers. Thailand's family planners are also getting more acceptors than they have money to handle.

Short of the Maoist model, no one has yet come up with a formula to combine economic advance with full employment and equitable income distribution. This means the gap between rich and poor inevitably widens. The drama of most poor countries today is a race between the onset of revolutionary politics and the arrival of genuine economic progress, through traditional schemes of development, to make such revolutionary politics unnecessary. To buy time for the race to be fairly run, the poor countries must grow enough food.

The present transfer of resources from rich countries to poor has been stuck at \$6 billion a year, what it was five years ago; official aid from the world's 16 richest countries is still only 0.35 percent of gross national product, half of what it was 10 years ago. Yet in those 10 years real incomes in the richest countries have risen 45 percent.

The present world food crisis has revealed the poor countries, physical incapacity to produce enough food at present foreign aid levels. It has shown the United States can no longer be counted upon as the emergency breadbasket of the world. If no increases in United States foreign aid are quickly forthcoming and the poor countries find themselves powerless to escape the vicious circle in which they are enclosed, international politics will be profoundly changed. It is time for individual Americans to strongly support foreign aid. Their children's well-being depends on it.

Mr. ABOUREZK obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. President, a point of information. Did I understand the Senator from South Dakota was willing to yield to the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TART), so we could proceed with his amendment?

Mr. ABOUREZK. Yes, I intend to do that as soon as I get recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 462.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read amendment No. 462.

Mr. ABOUREZK, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Amendment No. 462 is as follows:

On page 30, line 23, insert the following:

"Sec. 24. Part II of the Foreign Assistance Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 659. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this or any other Act, and none of the local currencies accruing under this or any Act, shall be used to provide training or advice, or provide any financial support, for police, prisons, or other internal security forces of any foreign government or any program of internal intelligence or surveillance on behalf of any foreign government."

On page 9, at the end of line 7, add quo-

S 18238

tation marks and delete line 8 through line 11.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) be allowed to call up his amendment before the consideration of my amendment No. 462.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is unprinted, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 11, delete lines 17 and 18 under the heading "Programs Relating to Population Growth" and substitute the following: "for each of the fiscal years 1972 and 1973, \$125,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "for the fiscal year 1974, \$125,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1975, \$150,000,000."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have already just briefly discussed the provisions of this amendment.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment does not change the authorization for fiscal year 1974 nor does it add any additional funding for fiscal year 1975. What the amendment does is to provide for a modest increase of \$25 million in earmarked funding for 1975 programs relating to population growth so as to maintain the continuing momentum of this crucially important endeavor.

There is no need to reiterate the importance of family planning and population programs in this body, for the Senate, under the leadership of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the manager of this bill today, and a number of other Senators has shown great vision and foresight in providing funds for family planning and insuring that the U.S. Agency for International Development will provide vigorous support in this field.

It is especially important that U.S. support for population programs continues to expand somewhat to meet the rising crescendo of national program requests for assistance in this field.

Because of the support which has been provided to these programs by U.S. AID, the United Nations Fund for Population Activities has now become a source of major international support and encouragement for new family planning programs throughout the developing world. Year 1974 is World Population Year and already the fund is faced with more requests for help than it can support. I would hope that much of this additional \$25 million will be provided directly by AID to the United Nations Fund for Population Activities to continue its work. The U.S. Government provides less than one-half of the fund's resource and to date contributions for the fund have come from some 60 countries.

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., whom many of you may know, is the U.S. Representative on the U.N. Population Commission, and has been extremely active in soliciting contributions from other governments for the U.N. Fund for Popu-

lation Activities. He is very much concerned that unless the U.S. Government increases its contribution somewhat in 1975, it will be difficult to persuade other governments to substantially increase their contributions.

With world population growth still averaging 2 percent each year, or approximately 75 million new mouths to be fed every year, there is surely no program more critical and more deserving of support than this. I would emphasize that this amendment does not add to the total sum authorized but rather requires that out of whatever sum may be eventually appropriated for foreign assistance activities for fiscal year 1975, \$150 million will be available for family planning and population programs.

There is already substantial evidence, as indicated in some of the graphs and statistics of recent reports, that family planning programs do have a considerable impact in reducing fertility rates. Although many factors are involved in the shift from larger to smaller families, there can be no doubt that the availability of family planning information, services, and supplies is a major factor in accelerating these declines. Without continuing assistance many of the national family planning programs in developing countries may be literally forced by the pressures of famine to cut back temporarily on family planning programs even though they recognize that over the long run fertility must be reduced or economic and social development cannot continue. Continued support from U.S. AID is essential in many countries, even where the Government is fully committed to family planning to insure that programs continue at an effective level.

We were all told of this necessity in the foreign aid field back in 1967. When I was on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I was author of the first amendment in the committee for the earmarking of those funds for that purpose. I can report to the Senate at this time that these earmarkings increased from \$30 million to \$50 million to \$75 million to \$100 million and to \$125 million today.

We know that expenditures under the AID program have continued to follow the same pattern. During the past year, there have been \$125 million of authorizations. As reported on page 10 of the committee report, the amount is \$25 million.

I think the fact that we are bumping against the ceiling at the present time would indicate that it is desirable to specifically earmark funds for this type of program for fiscal year 1975 so that there can be planning for the earmarking that has occurred and that will occur in the future as it has in the past.

Mr. President, it is on this basis and for this reason that I have offered the amendment. I note from the very generous remarks of the Senator from Minnesota that he would be delighted to have his name added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would be honored to have my name added as a cosponsor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) be

listed as a cosponsor of my amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment, as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has mentioned, is a very necessary and desirable addition. It is a modest addition to the bill. However, it goes to meet the problems we face on this issue; namely, population.

If the distinguished Senator from Vermont has no objection, I would suggest that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HUGHES). Do the Senators yield back their time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio (putting the question).

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, there is a printing error in my amendment, No. 560. Two numbers were assigned to the amendment. The amendment was printed identically as amendment No. 560 and 562. At the time I call up that amendment, I will be referring only to amendment No. 560.

Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 462.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 30, line 23, insert the following:

"Sec. 24. Part III of the Foreign Assistance Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 659. LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this or any other Act, and none of the local currencies accruing under this or any Act, shall be used to provide training or advice, or provide any financial support, for police, prisons, or other internal security forces of any foreign government or any program of internal intelligence or surveillance on behalf of any foreign government."

On page 9, at the end of line 7, add quotation marks and delete line 8 through line 11.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator defer on that until more Senators are present.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I withdraw my request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, this amendment is intended to provide a prohibition of U.S. financial aid or equipment, either directly or indirectly, to any foreign government for use in that gov-

ernment's internal security forces, prisons, or programs of domestic surveillance.

In addition to the \$7.5 million which is scheduled for the Office of Public Safety in 1974, well over an additional \$22 million will be spent on police and prison programs in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. In Vietnam alone, where we have spent over \$130,000,000 on their police since 1955, the United States is scheduled to spend another \$19.5 million.

The present bill, under section 115, would only prohibit U.S. financial support of programs conducted for police training. Unfortunately, this is only a small part of our involvement in support of police and prisons in other countries.

This amendment prohibits American equipment from being sent to foreign national police forces; it stops the mockery of food for peace whereby 80 percent of Public Law 480 funds are used for national security; and finally, it removes the redundancy which already exists between our OPS and the prestigious international police organizations which have existed long before OPS was ever conceived.

Few programs have distorted the spirit of our foreign assistance more than foreign police and prison support. For example, from 1965 to 1972, AID supplied \$2.9 million worth of fragmentation grenades to the national police forces of three countries; in 1971 the U.S. Navy paid an American firm \$400,000 to construct and deliver new isolation cells—called tiger cages—to Con Son Island in South Vietnam. One would be hard pressed to find the American humanitarian spirit in furnishing grenades and isolation cells. This amendment removes the distortion of U.S. foreign assistance.

The history of our involvement in the internal police affairs of other countries goes back as far as World War II and the Korean war. In Vietnam, for example, the United States has been providing aid in the form of weapons, supplies, training, and advisory support to the national police since 1954. Under the public safety program of the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Vietnamese police force was converted from a modest civil agency of 19,000 men in 1963 to a mammoth paramilitary organization of 120,000 men in 1973. Acknowledged U.S. spending on this effort amounted to \$169 million between 1967 and 1973. These figures do not include CIA payments, or local currencies made available through the commodity import program and other U.S. accounts. These funds were used to provide small arms, vehicles, and helicopters and other equipment to the Vietnamese police and to finance the team of over 200 U.S. public safety advisors which assisted the National Police Command in Saigon. Under the terms of the January 1973, peace settlement, the United States has been obliged to remove its public safety mission from South Vietnam; yet, despite our obligation to refrain from involvement in Vietnam's internal political affairs, the United States will continue providing aid and

advisory support to the GVN apparatus to the tune of \$20 million in 1974.

South Vietnam's national police force is only one of over 70 countries, however, that has been the direct beneficiary of our advice and assistance through our present foreign assistance programs, particularly the OPS.

In 1970, for example, the Guatemalan national police force received, among other material, 250 riot shields, 10 gas guns, 3,000 tear gas grenades, 245 tear gas projectiles, 250 gas masks, 55 shotguns, and 40,000 shotgun shields.

From 1965 to 1972, the United States supplied the national police forces of Vietnam, Korea, and Thailand with nearly \$3 million worth of fragmentation grenades, machineguns, rocket mortars, and antipersonnel mines.

Since 1959, we have supplied the Brazilian police force alone with over 500 riot batons, 120 gas masks, 20,000 grenades of all sorts, and over 800,000 rounds of ammunition.

Under the food-for-peace program for 1974 which my friend and colleague from Minnesota originated and worked so hard for in earlier years, over \$300,000 was originally directed to the Vietnamese political warfare college, over \$900,000 was originally scheduled for police training centers in 1974, and over \$525,000 was to go to rebuilding police materials including batteries and their containers.

Similar aid has gone to almost every one of over 75 countries which asked for and received aid to their national police forces.

Evidence is mounting that representatives of U.S. agencies are even involved in torture with some of the national police forces in many underdeveloped countries. A letter which I recently received from a constituent in my own State of South Dakota reaffirmed much of this evidence. He writes:

My wife and I spent the summer in eastern Bolivia. Stories of torture and execution under the Banzer dictatorship circulate freely. Their stories of torture are almost unbelievable in what was only a few short years ago the land of absolute freedom of expression, the Switzerland of South America. At least one of the torturers told one of our friends that he learned his techniques in a special American school in the Canal Zone. An American missionary friend who was tortured for four days before his release, insists that at least one American was involved in the torture squad.

AID officials, of course, deny that they teach methods of torture, but the significance of our attitude toward methods and effects of torture was best summed up by Byron Engle, a former Director of the Office of Public Safety. Citing the successful application of their techniques in the Dominican Republic in 1965, he said:

Police action... was so effective that the insurgents did not even end up with the body of a dead comrade to drag through the city in false martyrdom.

Justification for U.S. assistance to national police and prisons has always been presented in the most benign terms. AID officials tell us that the objective of U.S. public safety programs have been to "maintain public order; counter Commu-

nist inspired subversion; and encourage the effectiveness of the civil police and paramilitary forces in every participating country."

However, the evidence indicates that many of AID's justifications have been nothing more than hollow rhetoric designed for Congress. I cannot see how the continuation of our police training and police related assistance programs can possibly have much humanitarian benefit for the people in these oppressed countries. Within the context of internal politics, I can see no other purpose in such programs than to help consolidate the power of dictators and squash their opposition.

David Bell, a former AID Administrator summed this up better than I could. He said:

Public safety assistance and recipient police forces cannot prevent coups or guarantee that Communism will not seriously disrupt orderly development. However, the public safety assisted police forces have done and can do much to prevent conspiracy and the development of disruptive situations, and to insure an environment of law and order which supports the orderly social, economic and political development of emerging nations.

It should not be surprising, therefore, that the small privileged classes in most of the developing nations rely more and more on their national police forces to preserve the old order; nor is it surprising that such governments are incapable of developing viable democratic institutions. When we provide economic support and police training and assistance for these regimes, we are contributing to the maintenance of these archaic structures at the price of tremendous repression.

A second point which I would like to make may best be illustrated by a comment recently made by the wife of a cabinet minister in one of the more conservative governments in Latin America. She was quoted as saying:

I don't know to what extent the United States was really involved in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile; what I do know is that all of us are going to believe that your country did have a part in it.

In the minds of many countries around the world, the foreign policy of the United States has increasingly come to mean police power, military aid, military alliances, and support for repressive and authoritarian governments as a means of creating our own definition of world stability.

There is no question that social peace and true international peace can only be built upon the basis of justice and good will. All of the grenades, all of the tiger cages, all of the sophisticated police equipment that we continue to export to countries which are supposedly plagued with so-called chronic instability—all of this will never produce true peace.

Peace is the result of full participation of all peoples in the society in which they live. Peace is the result of justice and dignity. Peace is the result of rule by rational law. We cannot maintain peace in any country, or help build it, by continuing our incessant fetish for training, equipping, and financially supporting the

October 1, 1973

national police forces of countries in South America, in countries of Africa, and in the countries of Asia. We will never help build sound constitutional government abroad by supporting those who break the law, and those who confuse the supposed efficiency of totalitarianism with progress. The time has come for us to take stock of our foreign policy, and to recognize how far and how dangerously we have allowed our foreign aid program to stray from the ideals for which the country stands. The policies of AID and OPS in regard to our goals, doctrines, and practices in countries abroad have struck an eerie resemblance to practices advocated by some here at home as an answer to present or future domestic difficulties. AID spokesmen have in fact made a determined effort to advise other Government officials of the domestic application of techniques developed by OPS for use abroad.

Mr. President, earlier this year a Brazilian citizen came to my office. In the short time that he was there, he left an indelible impression on my mind of the torture, oppression, and death that lingers in many countries today. In Brazil, he told me, there is no means with which to speak out. There is no way in which these oppressed peoples can express their concern and anxiety for their own safety and the future of their country. Their only hope, he said, is to see that someone outside must show that they care—for their greatest fear is of being forgotten. He pleaded with me as one Senator, to speak out, to act in any way that I can to show these people that most of us here in the United States do care enough to want to help. That is what this amendment is all about. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this amendment in demonstrating that it is not our intention to make repressive regimes even more repressive. Rather, it is to assist those who are in dire need of some true humanitarian assistance.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ABOUREZK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am just wondering what the Senator's amendment would do that is not already provided for in section 115, page 9 of the Senate bill.

Mr. ABOUREZK. The section in the bill only cuts out the police training program in this country. I would advise my colleague from Vermont that there is a considerable amount of financial aid that goes to providing material support and even advisory support in the countries where the money is going. There is an additional \$18.5 million that this amendment would cut out that is being used for those purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's amendment would not prevent training of people from other countries if trained in this country?

Mr. ABOUREZK. Yes, it would include that.

Mr. AIKEN. It would include all of them?

Mr. ABOUREZK. It would prevent, let me say it this way—

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator mentioned Brazil as one country where we have been doing a lot of training. It would apply to all others too?

Mr. ABOUREZK. [continuing]. It would apply to any countries to which our foreign aid money is sent.

Mr. AIKEN. I am thinking particularly of countries like Lebanon and Jordan. Would it apply to them?

Mr. ABOUREZK. It would apply to them, yes.

Mr. AIKEN. To all countries?

Mr. ABOUREZK. If they are receiving money. If they are receiving money for training of police, it would cut off money for them as well.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the difference? Could it still be done under the guise of military training? Police training? Where does one begin and the other leave off?

Mr. ABOUREZK. If it is done under the guise of military training, if this amendment succeeds and is enacted into law, I would suggest that we try to do something about that as well.

What I am saying to my colleague from Vermont is that I do not believe we have any business in providing money for police forces or training police forces in other countries where most of that money is used to suppress their own people.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there any objection to countries using the funds for preservation of law and order in their own countries?

Mr. ABOUREZK. If you can call it preservation of law and order, I would say it is for suppressing their own people, rather than law and order. It is for violating the law, in most cases.

Mr. AIKEN. I was thinking of one country in particular; it happens to be an Asian country—

Mr. ABOUREZK. I am sorry; I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. I was thinking of an Asian country, which I shall not name here, where the police were being trained to do other work besides law enforcement. Would it affect that, too?

Mr. ABOUREZK. As the amendment states, it would affect the money provided by this AID program for the office of public safety, for police and advisory support and for the furnishing of material to any foreign police department.

Mr. AIKEN. But in this particular country I think police were being trained in community work, such as the work done by our extension service here. Our people are training the police of that country to do something besides enforce the law and put people in jail, and so forth. I was just wondering, would it affect that, too?

Mr. ABOUREZK. Will the Senator tell me—

Mr. AIKEN. If the members of the police force in that other country happened to be concerned with extension service-type activity for instance?

Mr. ABOUREZK. If the police were doing that, I would suggest they ask for their money under a different designation, rather than under this particular amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Not having all answers myself, that is, was why I am asking the

Senator from South Dakota for some enlightenment. That is all I have to say now.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, there is a technical error in the amendment that I should like to correct at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT). The Senator has that right.

Mr. ABOUREZK. On the first page of the amendment, on line 1, it says, "On page 30, line 23, insert the following." That should read, "On page 31, line 14." Then there should be a newly numbered section. This is just a correction of the page numbering and the line numbering.

I would offer that as a modification of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment.

I am not sure that I shall oppose it. On the contrary, I think we can perhaps work out the matter here in order to support it; but I wanted to take this moment to caution my good friend from South Dakota that all of the moneys that have gone into police training have not been injurious to the citizenry of many of these countries. Every country must have a government, and governments always have opposition. Some governments—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT). If the Senator would respond to an inquiry from the Chair. Is the Senator opposed to this amendment? The Chair is thinking of the allocation of time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am in charge of the time. The amendment is offered—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state that the Senator is in charge of the time, but if he is opposed to the amendment—it is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Minnesota is not opposed—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am in charge of the bill. This is an amendment to the bill.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield. I would be happy to yield him 5 minutes—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to clarify this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to clarify also with the Senator from Minnesota whether the Chair's understanding is correct that if the Senator from Minnesota is opposed to the amendment, then he is entitled to share the time with the proponents of the amendment. On the other hand, if the Senator from Minnesota is in favor, then the time is allocated to the minority member or his designee. So I would ask the Senator if he is in favor of the amendment or whether he is opposed to it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not feel obligated to tell the Presiding Officer that at all. With all due respect to the Presiding Officer, I have the responsibility for this bill, being its floor manager, and I will take my time on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will come around to deciding whether I am for or against the amendment after we have had some discussion on it.

The first thing I want to say to the Senator from South Dakota is that while much of what he says today surely has genuine meaning in light of what has developed over the years, it is important for the Record that we not put down what I call the public safety programs as having been antipeople, antidemocratic, as having been an expression of American force and villainy. On the contrary, many of the programs have served very well over the years and have served the public. We train our own police in this country. I was the mayor of a large city once and I spent a good deal of time getting the police trained, not with foreign assistance money, of course. But I happen to be one of those people who believe that we need a police department. Just because someone comes up and says, "The police have messed me up" does not mean that he is right.

When I ran the police department of a large city, many people thought they should not have been arrested when I thought our biggest mistake might have been that we did not arrest enough people. So I believe in training the police to be responsible individuals.

In this instance that we are talking about, foreign assistance to countries and whether American funds should be provided by this Government for those countries for police training there, it is a fact that over the years we have done a good deal of good work, because of the situation which developed in some of those countries.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has taken a view in opposition to police training being supported by American dollars. Under section 115, therefore, of the present bill, it says,

SEC. 115. PROHIBITING POLICE TRAINING.—No part of any appropriation made available to carry out this or any other provision of law shall be used to conduct any police training or related program for a foreign country."

I understand that this same language is in the military assistance bill. So we have tried to cover it in two places.

What the Senator from South Dakota is seeking to do is to expand on that language and be more precise, as I see it.

I would also note to the Senator that we should know what the amendment will do. Every country that has police training funds does not have a government that is antidemocratic. For example, I would note that a country such as Venezuela, has a Christian-Democratic President at the present time, free and open elections, a free press, and has received funds under the public safety program.

Another country, Jamaica, has open and free elections, an elected parliamentary system of government, a free press, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and they have received police training funds.

El Salvador is surely a very democratic country. Of all the little South American countries there is none more democratic than El Salvador.

Costa Rica takes great pride in its democracy.

These are some of the countries—there are many others—which have received these funds. Some countries have used them to good purpose. What I am sure my colleague from South Dakota is most concerned about is the publicity and the reports that we have received from Indochina about the abuse of police power there.

I would remind the Senator from South Dakota that they have been at war over there for a long, long time. No matter which government is in power, there is always a police department. The police training which has taken place is a considerable part of the total national security and national defense.

But when I look at this amendment, as I read it, it says, in part—

None of the funds made available to carry out this or any other Act, and none of the local currencies accruing under this or any Act shall be used to provide training or advice, . . .

That is already covered in the present bill.

Then it says—

. . . or provide any financial support, for police, prisons, or other internal security forces of any foreign government or any program of internal intelligence or surveillance on behalf of any foreign government.

That is a very broad sweep of limitation. I do not think that Congress particularly wants to see this Government engaged in police activity in other countries. In my judgment, just as we have a training program here in Washington, D.C., for our allies in the military—for example, most of our allies are brought over to Fort Bragg or Fort Leavenworth and other places for advanced training in military tactics and we have never tried to do away with that. As a matter of fact, it is looked on as somewhat of an asset.

In this instance, as I understand it, this amendment would prohibit the training of police in the United States. It would prohibit the use of funds to train police in any other part of the world. It would also prohibit the use of funds for the financial support of police or for any type of equipment for the police. I think it is a broad-ranging amendment. But I find myself in sympathy with its objectives. I really do not know what its total impact would be.

For example, when—

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes—but I remember being in Korea some years ago, when over 2,000 North Koreans moved down into the capital of Seoul and got within a few hundred yards of what they call the Blue House, which is similar to our White House. It was the Korean police who intercepted them.

We put a lot of blood, sweat, and tears into South Korea over the years. Those police were trained by the help of the American public safety program. There is no doubt that the Korean police have been used on some native South Koreans. There is no doubt about that.

Just exactly as some American police are used on some native Americans. It is rather difficult to know which ones are being set upon or which ones are violators of the law.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I realize there are some countries that will be aimed at in the amendment which do not deserve it. I am sorry about that, and I am willing to concede the point. But if the Agency for International Development were to perform its moral duty and call on countries to provide police and train them there would be no need for this amendment. But they will not do that.

As a matter of fact, they are lobbying in the Senate. There was lobbying last week against two amendments that I am offering. There is vigorous lobbying by the AID people going on. As a matter of fact, one contacted a representative of my staff. But there are others interested in making it discretionary. I do not know whether we are capable of making the decision.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a list of the countries listed on page 18 of the committee report. I think that will give us the detailed information we need as to the countries involved.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PUBLIC SAFETY PROGRAM FUNDING

(In thousands of dollars)

	Fiscal year—		
	1972 actual	1973 estimated	1974 request
Supporting assistance funding.....	14,077	10,884	4,215
Vietnam.....	8,948	6,762
Thailand.....	4,773	3,660	3,755
Laos.....	356	462	460
Nigeria.....	(3,400)
Technical assistance funding:			
Asia.....	1,003	530	100
Korea.....	(17)
Pakistan.....	75
Philippines.....	958	530	4,100
Saudi Arabia.....	(?)	(?)	(?)
Latin America.....	3,023	2,566	2,162
Bolivia.....	201	211	112
Brazil.....	137
Colombia.....	347	355	375
Costa Rica.....	150	123	100
Dominican Republic.....	282	50
Ecuador.....	192	216	190
El Salvador.....	65	57	53
Guatemala.....	456	490	289
Guyana.....	71
Honduras.....	182	125	146
Jamaica.....	94	85	90
Nicaragua.....	107	210	200
Panama.....	218	189	180
Uruguay.....	252	210	200
Venezuela.....	269	245	227
Africa.....	1,298	1,257	985
Africa regional training.....	206	210	200
Ghana.....	131	195	100
Liberia.....	178	187
Tunisi.....	131
Zaire.....	652	665	685
AID/W projects.....	85
Grand total.....	19,516 (3,417)	15,237	7,462

¹ Supporting assistance loan.

² Charges to mission's administrative cost.

³ Self-funded.

⁴ Project under review for possible increase in funding.

Source: AID.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think this is perhaps a development that is overdue. We are trimming the program back substantially. I prefer to say that this is what we

October 1, 1976

use for developmental purposes. In my judgment, these countries are better able to provide their own training and hire their own technicians. They need to improve their training facilities. I should like to see our country out of the training business, particularly in countries where there are police officers who treat persons promiscuously with brutality and cruelty and whose civil liberties and rights are being violated.

I understand the Senator from South Dakota would like a rollcall vote on this amendment. I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am just a little uncertain as to the overall picture. The House has a different provision entirely. I may be willing to have the amendment taken to conference. If we had a rollcall vote, there might be a flaw in the amendment which would require me to vote against it. I understand what the Senator from South Dakota is trying to do. He is working for a good purpose. It is possible the matter could be worked out in conference to accomplish his purpose with the least damage.

Mr. ABOUREZK. That is precisely the reason why I should like a rollcall vote. I am afraid of what may happen in conference.

Mr. AIKEN. It will be in conference just the same.

Mr. ABOUREZK. At least the conferees will know how the Senate stands, one way or the other.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If I were named as a conferee—and I would expect to be—whether it is a rollcall vote or a voice vote, my responsibility in the conference would be to follow through on the Senate's position. We will do it one way or the other.

Mr. AIKEN. A number of times it has been necessary to call upon American trained police to go to our Embassies and to other areas. I am sure that the Senator means all right, but I think his proposal would not work unless it were amended somewhat.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I am not asking that police departments be shut down. I am saying there are so many abuses that are perpetrated with American foreign aid that we ought to shut down our aid.

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question about that.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not have sufficient time for a quorum call under the unanimous-consent agreement. The Senator from Vermont controls the time for the minority. The Senator from Minnesota has indicated his support of the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield 5 minutes for a quorum call, if I have that much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, first, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to explain a little further why I am against the amendment. We are now undertaking to cut down our own military forces for our own people in our Embassies all over the world. That means that we have to depend more upon the police of the countries where the Embassies are located. If the Ambassador talks it over with the local police and cooperates with them, and they cooperate with him, I am afraid that might constitute police instruction and be prohibited by this amendment. I do not know. I am going to be on the safe side and vote against the amendment at this time, although I give the Senator from South Dakota full credit for good intentions.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I ask unanimous consent that at this time it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on amendment No. 560, which will come up after this amendment is voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I now ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. ABOUREZK. We have lost our quorum. There are not 11 Senators present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ABOUREZK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has not yielded back his time yet; has he?

Mr. ABOUREZK. No.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have a vote at 2:30. That is what is causing us difficulty. I wonder if we might agree on holding this vote over until after the vote on the treaties because then we will have more Senators present.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I shall defer the request for the yeas and nays until we have more Senators in the Chamber. I am prepared to yield back my time on amendment No. 462.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may clarify the situation, the yeas and nays have been ordered on the pending amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That is the understanding of the Senator from Minnesota. The only question I pose to the Senator from South Dakota is whether or not, in light of the scheduled vote on the treaties at 2:30 p.m., he might agree to having the vote on his amendment after the vote on the treaties.

Mr. ABOUREZK. If we proceeded to vote now it would not make much difference. We have 10 minutes in which to do something.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I might suggest that we make the unanimous-consent request that immediately following the vote on

the treaties we vote on the Abourezk amendment.

Mr. ABOUREZK. That is fine. If the Senator wishes we could make it a 10-minute vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the vote which already has been authorized on the treaties that we follow immediately thereafter with a vote on the Abourezk amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have a little hiatus here. I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum unless someone wishes to speak, in preparation for the vote on the treaties with the time not charged to either side.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the time remaining on both sides of the amendment will be vitiated by having the vote immediately after the vote on the treaties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the understanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. So the only time available to speak for or against the amendment is between now and 2:30.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understood that the Senator from South Dakota had completed his argument and I understood that the Senator from Vermont had completed his argument.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time has not been yielded back.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, if I may be recognized, I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that we yield back our time now to take care of the situation. I am prepared to yield back my time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back all of my time except to reiterate what I said before, that I cannot agree to any proposal which would prevent an American ambassador in a foreign country from furnishing equipment or even advice to the local police of that country whose forces are trying to protect our U.S. Embassy.

Now, I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands all time has now been yielded back.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I again ask unanimous consent that following the votes on the treaties we proceed to vote immediately on the Abourezk amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

VOTED DOWN

There have been many instances of inhumane treatment around the world as to which we have not taken action. I do not think it was necessary, or even responsible, that every time there is an attack of inhumanity created or perpetrated on a helpless people, whether in Greece or Brazil, or anywhere else, it was incumbent upon us to submit a resolution. We have already expressed ourselves. There is nothing it demands. It does not demand any action on a minority.

I think the Senator from a procedural point of view, has proceeded in more haste than the Austrian Government did in making this regulation. I do not know why the resolution should not be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Secretary of State. After all, the Secretary of State bears a responsibility for trying to find some solution to the war in the Middle East. I think he would find it a wise thing to do.

The Senator agrees that the resolution is not germane to the bill, does he not?

Mr. MONDALE. No, I do not think it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing in the bill having to do with this question whatever.

Mr. MONDALE. I believe it is very germane to the purposes of the bill and, more than that, I think it is important that we act immediately.

The Austrian Government, right now, I assume, is in discussion as to whether they will continue the policy announced yesterday resulting in permanent closing of what may be the only important exit for Soviet Jews.

To remain silent and have long-term hearings and delay this effort, in my judgment, would be taken as an action of silence on what is, in my opinion, something that has an outrageous impact upon these people who wish to gain their freedom.

For that reason I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I think basic human instincts would cause us to support this resolution.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama who, I understand, has a request to make.

Mr. ALLEN. As I understand it, the Senator's modification in section 23(a) (1), he knocks out the words "succumb to the demands of extreme Arab terrorists and," and then knocks out the entire section (2), which speaks of the decision to yield to terrorist blackmail.

I notice that in section (b) (1) the same thought carries forward in the words "impress upon the Austrian Government the grave concern of the American people"—and here is the continuation of the objectionable language which, in effect, constitutes a lecture on our part to the Austrian Government, "that capitulation to terrorists encourages further attempts at blackmail."

If that were left out it would call upon the President to determine steps to impress upon the Austrian Government the grave concern of the American people which, it seems to me, would cover the situation—if that is what the Senator wishes to convey to the Austrian Govern-

ment; the concern of the American people—and would not carry over the same objectionable language.

Mr. MONDALE. If the Senator will return the amendment, because it is the only copy I have, I would be glad to respond to his suggestion by modifying my amendment to delete the following phrase appearing in subsection (b) (1) following the word "people": "that capitulation to terrorists encourages further attempts at blackmail."

I do so not because I think the language speaks inaccurately, and I do so not because I think this reaction to terrorists is something that should be unrecognized; I do it at the suggestion of the Senator from Alabama to make it clear that we seek to recognize that the traditional policy of the Government of Austria permitting the immigration of Soviet Jews through Austria is a valid and proper one; we hope they will return to it.

That is what the resolution will say with this modification.

Mr. President, I so modify my amendment. However, may I say, I do believe that based upon the evidence thus far, the phrase that is now being deleted refers accurately and precisely to what happened. This is well established policy of the Government of Austria and the only reason they changed was that two armed gunmen came aboard a train, captured some innocent Soviet emigres, and at gunpoint threatened their lives and held them hostage until the Government of Austria changed its policy. That is what happened.

But in the interest of trying to make the main point; namely, that our Government make clear our strong concern that it reverse the decision and again permit group travel by Soviet Union emigrants, I accept that modification and I make it now.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I congratulate the Senator from Alabama. I certainly think he made a very great contribution.

I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota would consider providing that subsection (2) of section (b) might read something like this:

Urges the Austrian Government to continue its policy to continue travel by emigrants.

It would put the language in the affirmative.

Mr. MONDALE. I have no objection to that as long as it is clear we want the policy continued of group emigration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. "Urges the Austrian Government to continue its policy of group travel by Soviet emigrants." That would make it more in accord.

Mr. MONDALE. How about "resume and continue," would the Senator object?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No, but I prefer the affirmative approach.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send the modification to the desk?

Mr. MONDALE. Subsection (2): "Call upon the Austrian Government to resume and continue"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. "Urges the

Austrian Government to resume and continue its decision and again permit group travel by Soviet Union emigrants." It urges them instead of calling upon them.

This demand on our part and the implication bring on all sorts of possibilities, such as cutting off credit, removing the most favored nation clause—such as we used on the Chilean Government. They could use economic and other pressures.

Mr. MONDALE. I see no difference between "call upon" and "urges." I have no objection to changing that. It will read:

Urges the Austrian Government to revive and continue its decision and again permit group travel by Soviet Union emigrants through Austria on their way to freedom and new lives.

Mr. President, I so modify the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator have the modification written?

Mr. MONDALE. Yes, what is left of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

The amendment is so modified.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for 2 minutes? I do not wish to delay the matter any more.

Mr. AIKEN. If I have 2 minutes, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I, of course, think this is greatly improved, and it has removed the most offensive language. I do not think it will do any great harm.

I wish only to state my position. I am opposed to this kind of off-the-cuff action by the Senate. People abroad do not understand the Senate and they take this action more seriously than the Senate. We cannot control the way the matter is reported in the press. They say "took action condemning the Austrian Government," and I think to do this without taking committee action and without the Secretary of State is not the wisest course.

When these matters are submitted to the committee we always ask the opinion of the executive branch and the Secretary of State, and it is reported to the Senate. In addition, it is clearly not germane to the bill. There is nothing in the bill that has to do with refugees or Austria. Austria is one of the few countries no longer on our handout list. So it has nothing to do with the main subject of the bill. It would not be germane except it involves a matter in which Israel is interested and, therefore, there is no point of putting it to a vote in the Senate. It would be ruled germane if it went to a vote. I do not favor the resolution but I will not make a point of order.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 2 minutes?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in my opinion what happened over the weekend was an outrage to humanity. Decent human beings, under a settled policy, were traveling through the only access

October 1, 1973

route they had from a state which has notoriously oppressed them, a state which has had a sad history of antisemitism, a state which has reduced the elementary human right of emigration, and they did so under the gun—not of reason, but under the gun—of two extreme terrorists who held innocent people hostages and, under the threat of death, insisted that the Government of Austria change its humane policies which permitted these Soviet emigres to leave the Soviet Union.

This resolution simply says that it is the sense of the Senate that we would hope the Government of Austria would not bend to such terroristic attacks and would revive and resume the humane policy of permitting Soviet emigres to pass through Austria, to use the facilities of Schonau Castle, and to permit group travel.

That, it seems to me, is the very minimum humane statement for the Senate to make.

One of the chief objections I have had to current foreign policy is that we remain silent too much—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MONDALE. May I have 1 minute?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 1 minute.

Mr. MONDALE. And too often in the face of offenses against humanity

As I understand it, our Government has yet to say a word about the treatment of Chilean dissidents. I was told by one of my colleagues that it took 3 days even to send a condolence note to President Allende's widow.

This Government has remained silent in the face of statements by Solzhenitsyn and Sakharov on Soviet Union policies, except for Mr. Weinberger, who condemned our own National Academy of Sciences and spoke in behalf of the oppressors of humanity.

Here again we have a chance to stand up for human beings and say we resent a decision by a government which is against humane treatment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I want to say that, as introduced, I could not have possibly supported the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, but the modification which he has made to the amendment puts the United States more in the position of a peacemaker.

Incidentally, I noticed in the news media today that Austria has suggested that if we feel so keenly, the United States can send planes to Russia to take the Jewish refugees out. It seems to me they are undertaking to tell us what to do and, you know, Mr. President, it does not go over so well when one country tells another what to do.

Under the circumstances, I see no harm in the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. AIKEN. If I have it.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I support the amendment, in the form of a sense of the Senate finding, by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and other Senators, expressing the concern

of the U.S. Senate and, through the Senate, the concern of the people of America at the plight of hundreds of thousands of Soviet Jews who, under the policy just announced by the Austrian Government, would not be permitted to travel in groups to Austria as they emigrate from Russia and go to Israel or any other nation.

I support the concept of urging that the Austrian Government continue to permit group travel by Soviet Union emigres through Austria on their way to freedom. I believe that the resolution as now worded deserves the support of the Senate.

Mr. MONLALE. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield back whatever time I have remaining on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDOUREZK) is recognized.

Mr. ABDOUREZK. Mr. President, this is on my amendment No. 560. It is being offered as a perfecting amendment to an earlier amendment, No. 462.

Amendment No. 560 is as follows:

On page 29 strike out lines 4 through 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 20. (a) No funds made available under this or any other law shall be used to provide economic or military assistance, or to make sales, credit sales, or guaranties, to or for any foreign country during any period in which the President determines that such country practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes. Upon making that determination, such assistance, sales, credit sales, and guaranties with respect to that country shall be terminated immediately and a copy of such determination transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

(b) Between July 1 and July 30 of each year, the President shall submit a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate certifying each foreign country which he determines is not engaged in practices of internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes. No such assistance, sale, credit sale, or guaranty shall be made—

(A) to or for any foreign country during that thirty-day period immediately following the day on which such report is submitted; and

(B) after the expiration of such thirty-day period, to or for any foreign country with respect to which such a certification is not made.

(c) If the President intends to provide during a fiscal year such assistance, or make such sale, credit sale, or guaranty, to or for a foreign country for which he has made no certification under subsection (b) of this section with respect to that fiscal year, or for which a certification was made but such assistance, sales, credit sales, and guaranties were terminated under subsection (a) of this section, he may submit a supplemental report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate certifying such coun-

try as satisfying the provisions of clauses (1) and (2) of subsection (b) of this section. No such assistance, sale, credit sale, or guaranty shall be made to or for any foreign country with respect to which the President has made such a certification during that thirty-day period immediately following the day on which such supplemental report is submitted.

(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply with respect to funds made available under section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ABDOUREZK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The hour is getting a little late. We do have some business to come before the Senate after this amendment is disposed of. I believe the yeas and nays are required. Would the Senator consider a limitation of time less than an hour?

Mr. ABDOUREZK. I have a statement of about 15 minutes, but if the majority leader would agree, and my colleagues would agree also, we could put this amendment over until tomorrow morning. I can do it either way.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think we ought to go ahead, then.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ABDOUREZK. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wonder if we could have 30 minutes on a side?

Mr. ABDOUREZK. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator be willing to take 20 minutes and we will take 10 minutes in opposition?

Mr. ABDOUREZK. I will agree to that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I make that unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ABDOUREZK. Mr. President, this amendment provides that no funds made available under this act shall be used to provide economic or military assistance to any foreign country which the President determines is practicing the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes. Upon making that determination such assistance would be terminated and a copy of the determination would be transmitted to the Speaker of the House and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The amendment also sets up an annual mechanism whereby the Congress would receive from the President a certification between July 1 and July 30, that a recipient country is not engaged in practices of internment or imprisonment of its citizens for political purposes. The amendment provides that the President submit supplemental reports to Congress should the administration intend to provide assistance to a country which was not on the certified list at the beginning of the fiscal year. The funds which are ordinarily available for disaster relief and similar purposes where the President can determine such use to be important to national interest, would not be included in the provisions of the amendment.

One respected international organization—Amnesty International—has defined political prisoners as:

Those who are imprisoned, detained, restricted or otherwise subjected to physical coercion or restriction by reason of their conscientiously held beliefs, or by reasons of their ethnic origin, color or language, provided they have not used or advocated violence.

The definition has been the determining measure in which international organizations of every religious, ethnic, and cultural background have agreed upon. One country where each of these organizations have applied the definition of political prisoners most vigorously is South Vietnam.

The Paris peace agreement guarantees democratic liberties to the South Vietnamese people, including freedom of political activity. Still, Saigon refuses to release its prisoners of conscience, and even goes to the absurd length of publicly pretending they do not exist.

The Canadian Anglican News Service estimates the total of South Vietnamese political prisoners at 240,000. Other estimates range from 100,000 by the Red Cross to 200,000 by Amnesty International, the French newspaper *Le Monde* quotes a South Vietnamese deputy as saying that the current Saigon prison budget calls for food allotments for 400,000 persons.

The State Department, and other U.S. agencies continue to ignore evidence of Saigon's brutality to prisoners. They continue to act as apologists for Thieu, even repeating his mistruths to members of Congress. Marshall Wright, acting secretary for congressional relations recently wrote to one of our distinguished colleagues in the Senate that the State Department sees no convincing evidence that the Thieu government is "bent upon a systematic, widespread campaign to incarcerate persons or groups with legitimate grievances." The Thieu government has expressly denied allegations of torture and executions in South Vietnamese prisons, says this State Department spokesman.

And yet, the deformed bodies of 124 political prisoners released last February gave further evidence of ill-treatment in Saigon's jails. Of these people a *Time* magazine correspondent wrote:

It is not really proper to call them men anymore. "Shapes" is a better word—grotesque sculptures of scarred flesh and gnarled limbs.

In testimony before a House Government Operations Subcommittee in July 1971, a former chief of the Public Safety Division in Vietnam said that public safety advisers had never made reports on inhumane treatment of prisoners to his office. And yet as far back as October, 1963, another public safety chief knew enough of prison conditions to call Con Son the "Devil's Island of the Pacific" and even described the shackling of "hard core" Reds to the floor of their cells.

The assertion that America has a responsibility for Saigon's imprisonment and treatment of political prisoners is based on the fact that the Thieu government fundamentally is a creation of U.S. policy, with the United States providing, directly and indirectly, as much as 90 percent of the Saigon budget. The United

States has continued to support the South Vietnamese police through "public safety" programs since 1955 and has provided "advice and assistance" to the prison system since 1963. As of 1971, the United States was providing 200 police specialists to "train and organize the national police on all levels." Under U.S. sponsorship, the Saigon police has grown from 16,000 in 1960 to 122,000 in 1973.

Further U.S. responsibility comes from the fact that many of the civilian political prisoners now in jail were arrested during operations by the U.S. military and were later turned over to South Vietnamese police.

Not only has the United States funded, advised, and trained Saigon police and prison personnel, but it has funded the construction of South Vietnamese prison facilities. The Provincial Interrogation Centers were built with U.S. funds and according to volunteers, construction work on at least one center was actually carried out by American Navy personnel.

In 1971, the U.S. Navy paid an American firm \$400,000 to build new "isolation cells" on Con Son Island to replace the old "tiger cages" uncovered in 1970. These new 6 feet by 8 feet cells which are smaller than the tiger cages were, now hold from three to five people.

Moreover, the Nixon administration shows no signs of abandoning Thieu in these policies and allowing the democratic liberties guaranteed the Vietnamese people by the Paris agreement. It is the 120,000-man force of U.S. funded police that is the mainstay of Thieu's support, not the overwhelming popular support as he would have us believe.

Let anyone think that South Vietnam has some kind of monopoly on political repression and internment of its citizens I would remind my distinguished colleagues that at least 6 other so-called friends of ours also hold over 57,000 political prisoners and practice the most barbaric forms of political repression utilizing both extreme forms of torture and assassination.

In Brazil, political dissent has become the instant object of police brutality under the Medici military dictatorship. Even more than police brutality, the Brazilian Government now officially sanctions systematic torture to the extent that it has now become a regular practice.

According to the estimates of one Brazilian expert, since 1964 between 40 and 120 people have died from torture or beatings, the great majority since 1968. This number does not include the estimated 200 to 300 people killed by the so-called "death squads" who are off-duty Brazilian policemen. There have been over 20,000 citizens interned for political reasons since 1964 and there are probably 1,000 political prisoners in Brazilian jails at this time, the majority of which have been subjected to extreme torture.

Mr. President, the military dictatorship responsible for this will get \$74 million in fiscal 1974 if this amendment fails.

When the United States is providing this kind of assistance to a government which carries out political repression

there is a serious question in my mind whether we can turn our heads and extend our arms with fistfuls of dollars which are theirs for the taking.

Greece has taken our aid for years while practicing some of the severest forms of repression. The corrupt Papadopoulos government is the very epitome of CIA involvement in foreign government creation. It is no longer a secret that without U.S. aid and internal security assistance, the military dictatorship could never exist.

At the same time reports of Greek repression and torture of its own citizens have come from all parts of the world, the United States is scheduled to give \$66 million in aid to Greece in 1974.

In Indonesia, a country to which the Nixon administration has scheduled \$250 million in 1974, over 55,000 political prisoners are being held. 55,000 men, women and children—a population the size of many of our most productive cities in this country—are being held, beaten, tortured and even assassinated with the full knowledge of U.S. officials for one reason—to stabilize the political fortunes of Indonesia's dictator, for political stability, the United States continues to allow our aid to legitimize all kinds of actions including the violation of the basic human rights which are supposedly guaranteed in the Indonesian legal system and in their constitution.

The prisoners are completely at the mercy of the soldiers in charge, who are taught to believe that their fellow citizens are "Communists," atheists, and traitors and are not worthy of humane treatment. Furthermore, the Indonesia Government has tiger cages of their own. Three and four prisoners are jammed into a cell no larger than a closet, with no medical facilities whatsoever.

And we fund this activity, Mr. President.

The United States of America, now over \$400 billion in debt, is giving a quarter of a billion dollars this year alone to a country whose jails hold a political prisoner population greater than the population of 99 percent of the towns in my home State of South Dakota. Yet, once again, we hold out our money and close our eyes.

Mr. President, this situation clings like a filthy stench on the American people. How can any American rationally explain our support of this Government without taking some responsibility for their repressive actions?

It would be easy to cite these countries as unfair exceptions and claim that, outside of these, we should be proud of our foreign economic assistance.

If only that were the case.

Our support of corrupt regimes who jail their own citizens does not stop with those examples.

In Bolivia, a country which is due to receive additional millions of dollars in U.S. aid, the 5 million Bolivian citizens are suffering from the cruel and despotic tyranny of a small group of military men who are sustained in large part by the CIA and our economic handouts. More than 2,000 intellectuals, students, union leaders, mothers, their children, and en-

October 1, 1973

tire families are found languishing in concentration camps created by the Bolivian Government. Assassination has become an everyday occurrence. In the daily raiding of houses by the Bolivian death squadrons, one or more citizens are killed under the pretext of "being subversives."

In Guatemala, articles in U.S. newspapers estimated that a total of 2,000 political assassinations have occurred from November 1970 to May of 1971, alone.

U.S. complicity in the official terror of the Guatemala Government has taken several forms. According to conservative figures, the United States has spent over \$34 million in supporting assistance to Guatemala. Millions have been spent on police vehicles, equipment and training. U.S. advisers train Guatemalan soldiers and police and provide them with much of the necessary equipment to carry out their constant acts of repression.

Violence and repression have become a way of life in Guatemala. Three of the last 8 years have been spent under a state of siege. On innumerable occasions, many of our largest and most respected international religious organizations have pleaded with the Government of Guatemala to put an end to the reign of terror which has existed in that country since 1968. But nothing has changed—on the contrary—things have gone from bad to worse. And to allow them to become worse, we are scheduled to give this government \$20.9 million in 1974.

Mr. President, our aid to these countries has not enhanced the living conditions of the people subjected to this repressive rule. It has not increased the understanding between our citizens and those of other countries, and it certainly has not enhanced the basic human rights of the people in these countries where torture, internment and constant surveillance are a matter of daily course.

The billions of dollars we give these countries has led to nothing but more bloodshed, more torture, and even graver degrees of repression of individual freedom and rights than ever before.

It is the teargas and ammunition we give to Brazil, the detention trucks we give Guatemala and the lime and tiger cages we give South Vietnam that has caused the American people to share in the guilt and horror which is inflicted on the poor people who live in these countries.

How can we give a quarter of a billion dollars to Indonesia, over \$2 billion to South Vietnam and billions of dollars to scores of other countries on one hand while at the same time cutting \$1.5 billion in elementary and secondary education, \$200 million in child nutrition, \$86 million in health training and education and hundreds of millions more in critical domestic needs in fiscal 1974 alone? Mr. President, I fear for the future of this country, if our priorities continue to be so malaligned. If ever we needed to take a close, painful look at our foreign economic assistance, the time is now. No longer can we allow our aid to be used for the cruelest and most inhumane treatment of the millions of people who live in the countries of so-called friend-

ly governments. Our conscience and national economic conditions will not allow it.

For us to prop up the foreign national military police forces, the "death squadrons" and the domestic intelligence organization which are used as instruments of political suppression and are responsible for the torture and assassination of thousands of people is a grave moral error. It simply cannot be allowed to continue.

The right of every sovereign nation to deal firmly with those citizens who have committed serious criminal acts is an inherent right and cannot be challenged. But for any country to expect assistance from the United States for initiating policies of terror and constant surveillance is ridiculous.

Only by ending our economic support for those governments holding political prisoners and by cutting all aid for foreign police and prisons can we ever, in good conscience, be proud of our foreign economic assistance program.

Only by directing our scarce funds to those programs which construct, rather than destroy the societies and living conditions of our friends throughout the world can we ever hope to regain the respect of the millions of people who compose the real mainstay in every sovereign country.

Our economic assistance will not be wasted, and the time we have spent here in debate will have been well spent, if we will only halt the irrational and immoral funding of these irreparable acts of repression and torture.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in a vote to clear our consciences and the conscience of the American people and once again restore our economic aid to the constructive assistance which it is intended to be.

I ask you to join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I share the strong feelings of the junior Senator from South Dakota about regimes which intern and imprison citizens for political purposes, and I commend his effort to legislate a control on U.S. assistance to such nations. Therefore, I would be inclined to support this amendment were it not so all inclusive. For example, under this amendment we could not provide aid to such a nation for child care, refugee relief, education, population planning, or the expansion of its agricultural production, even though these are areas of vital need.

My point is that denying some forms of foreign aid would actually make conditions of life even more difficult for the poor people of a country who should not be penalized because their government holds political prisoners. I see no reason why the people should be penalized for the sins of their masters.

Moreover, another area of foreign assistance which is of great personal interest and importance to our own people is aid in controlling the growth and distribution of narcotics which are carried to our country in the illicit international narcotics trade. Such assistance is in our national interest and should not be ruled

out because a government willing to cooperate may also hold political prisoners.

I would be eager to support, and I do support, other efforts to dissuade certain governments from the practice of oppressing their citizens for political purposes, but I do not believe that this proposal is prudent.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is a Senator who wants to speak on this proposal. I think that he will be here momentarily.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment does pose some serious difficulties. I understand the concern that the Senator has about political prisoners and our cooperation with countries who have incarcerated some of their fellow citizens.

The pending bill has a provision which reads as follows:

SEC. 20. It is the sense of Congress that the the President should deny any economic or military assistance to the government of any foreign country which practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes.

That language in my mind is still unsatisfactory. However, it was the best that the committee could come up with after giving long consideration to the whole subject matter proposed by the Senator from South Dakota. Who is a political prisoner and what is he? They incarcerate someone who may try to overthrow a government, even if the government is a legitimate democratic government.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am sorry that the Senator from Minnesota was not here when I gave a definition. I would be happy to do it again.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would be delighted to have it repeated. May I say that there is no definition in the measure.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Then I would like to offer an amendment to provide that definition.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator will do that on his own time.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I will do it on my own time. I understand that I have more time than the Senator from Minnesota does.

Mr. President, I offer this amendment as a definition:

A political prisoner shall be defined as someone who is interned or imprisoned for political purposes, which shall include those who are imprisoned, detained, restricted or otherwise subjected to physical coercion or restriction by reason of their ethnic origin, color, or language, provided they have not used or advocated violence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I say that we are trying to define some

international law here tonight. I think that it would be rather difficult to make it sufficiently precise to have real meaning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota desire to so modify his amendment?

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to so modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The amendment is so modified.

Would the Senator from South Dakota send the modification of his amendment to the desk?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, would the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. ABOUREZK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I think that this amendment should be taken to conference. I say frankly that the Senator from Rhode Island is very much disturbed not only with this matter, but we are also talking about how much aid we are going to give Thieu and his government.

We pick up the paper and find out about the tiger cages in which people are incarcerated.

The United States believes in freedom of thought and freedom of speech and in the ability of a man to be free and to say what he thinks.

I think this is a good amendment. It may need refinement. However, I would hope that it would go to conference. I would hope that we would vote.

I realize that it gets pretty difficult to define exactly what a particular situation is in this whole panorama of the world's injustices. However, I think we know what a political prisoner is. And I think all that the Senator from South Dakota is saying is that what we want here is to see that this Government not give money to people who practice those very principles that are anathema to our system. That is what we are saying. Let them use their own money.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from Rhode Island, that is exactly what we have in the bill. The bill already says:

It is the sense of Congress that the President should deny any economic or military assistance to the government of any foreign country which practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes.

It is in the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. That is right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And it seems to me that what we have in the bill is thoroughly adequate.

I might point out that the Amnesty International report, to which the Senator alluded, includes the United States. The United States is at the top of the list. Other countries that are involved, some of them rather friendly to us, in Latin America, include countries like El Salvador, Mexico—we do not do much for Mexico except, may I say, in terms of technical assistance, but that could be quite substantial—Uruguay, Colombia—these are friendly countries to us.

Israel would be excluded; she has political prisoners, and has incarcerated people who were incarcerated not because they used violence, but because they would be considered a threat to the state. There is Jordan, Iran—a country with whom we have most friendly relations.

I think we are better off to leave the language we have in the bill, which surely states our deep concern and directs the President to examine meticulously into these matters. There is nothing more that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota does than that, except that it broadens the whole concept. I happen to believe that we ought to leave well enough as it is.

I repeat again that the committee unanimously approved the language in section 20 of the bill. It is not as if this subject matter was not given serious consideration. Every member of that committee really went into it, and we came out with what we thought was the best we could get out in terms of defining what we mean by political prisoners, and directing the President to deny economic or military assistance to the government of any foreign country which practices the internment or imprisonment of that country's citizens for political purposes.

I must say in conclusion that I doubt that we are going to change the face of the world by this, but we do have a right, as I said about the Senator's other amendment, to see that our aid, whatever it is, and in whatever amount it is, is used for constructive development purposes. We hope that is what it will be used for, but I think we are deluding ourselves if we think that, for example, the countries of Africa, which desperately need American aid, the six countries of Western Africa do not do this. We know they do have political prisoners, but their people are starving to death, and have been through 4 years of drought.

All I am saying is that some of those people would be more victimized if we have such a restriction.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, there is a provision in my amendment which exempts disaster relief from the restriction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So my argument about West Africa would not prevail. But there are other areas of the African Continent. Take a country, for example, like Tunisia. There is no one more friendly to the United States than Bourguiba, the President of Tunisia. Tunisia is listed as one of those countries that would have to come under the purview of this amendment.

I think it is wise to have a sensible leader like Bourguiba speak up as he does for reason. All I am saying is that I believe the language in the bill has taken care of what the Senator from South Dakota really has in mind, and I do not believe we can give it any more positive construction than we have there.

I have no further comment.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I have just one comment. There is no attempt, by virtue of this amendment, to shut off money for people who are starving and who are poor. There is an attempt to stop dictatorships around the world from punishing and torturing their own people simply for speaking out against their government.

ple simply for speaking out against their government.

I think that is exactly what this amendment would do; it would frighten those governments into stopping torture and imprisonment. I am sure they are not going to give up this sizable fortune from the U.S. taxpayers in order to keep torturing their people. I think it would send them a message, as George Wallace used to say. Any of these countries that imprison their own people are certainly going to make the choice of continuing the money from America, rather than continuing that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that the record may be clear, the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota does not exempt Public Law 480 transactions, which are frequently used for assistance to countries that are impoverished.

Second, I would like to have printed in the Record a list of all the countries that would be affected by the terms of this amendment, as reported by the 1973 report of the amnesty international.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I object to that. Did the Senator ask unanimous consent?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can read them into the Record.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I object that this amendment does not use the list provided by amnesty international. It requires the President to certify to Congress each year that the countries that are going to receive aid are not perpetrating what I talk about in this amendment. It has nothing to do with the amnesty international list.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include the list, with the understanding that it is not definitive insofar as the Senator's amendment is concerned.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE AMERICAS

United States	El Salvador
Colombia	Mexico
Dominican Republic	Peru
Haiti	Bolivia
Uruguay	Cuba
Argentina	Guatemala
Brazil	Paraguay

THE MIDDLE EAST

Israel	Iran
Iraq	Jordan
Yemen	Libya
Saudi Arabia	Syria
Bahrain	Oman
Egypt	

ASIA

Indonesia	Sri Lanka
Taiwan	Cambodia
Malaysia	Thailand
Singapore	South Korea
Philippines	North Korea
Nepal	Bangladesh
Pakistan	South Vietnam
India	North Vietnam

AFRICA

Malawi	Angola
Mauritania	Uganda
Senegal	Botswana
Algeria	Burundi
Chad	Ivory Coast
Congo-Brazzaville	Ghana
Gabon	Kenya
Guinea	Lesotho
Mauritius	Madagascar
Sudan	Malawi

October 1, 1973

Morocco
Mozambique
Namibia
Nigeria
Rhodesia
Sierra Leone
South Africa

Somalia
Tanzania
Tunisia
Togo
Zambia
Guinea Bissau

EUROPE

West Germany
Netherlands
Yugoslavia
Spain
German Democratic Republic
Rumania
Greece
Italy

Northern Ireland
Portugal
Hungary
U.S.S.R.
Switzerland
England
Turkey
Czechoslovakia
Poland

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK). All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 535) of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABOUREZK). On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 67, as follows:

[No. 449 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Abourezk
Bayh
Biden
Burdick
Church
Clark
Cranston
Gravel

Hart
Harkin
Haskell
Huddleston
Mansfield
McGovern
Metcalfe
Moss

Nelson
Pastore
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Stevenson
Tunney
Williams

NAYS—67

Aiken
Allen
Bartlett
Beall
Bellmon
Bennett
Bentsen
Bible
Brook
Brooke
Buckley
Byrd
Harry F., Jr.
Byrd, Robert C.
Cannon
Case
Chiles
Cook
Cotton
Curtis
Dole
Domenici
Dominick

Eagleton
Eastland
Fannin
Fong
Goldwater
Griffin
Gurney
Hansen
Hatfield
Hathaway
Helms
Hollings
Hruska
Hughes
Humphrey
Inouye
Jackson
Johnston
Kennedy
Long
Magnuson
Mathias
McClellan

McClare
McIntyre
Mondale
Montoya
Muskie
Nunn
Packwood
Percy
Roth
Saxbe
Schweiker
Scott, Hugh
Scott,
William L.
Sparkman
Stafford
Stevens
Taft
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Welcker
Young

NOT VOTING—10

Baker
Ervin
Fulbright
Javits
McGee
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Stennis
Symington

So Mr. ABOUREZK's amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The third assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 535

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), and at his request, I call up Amendment No. 535 and ask that it be stated, only for the purpose of laying it before the Senate and making it the pending question before the Senate, for resumption on Tuesday, when the Senate returns to the consideration of the foreign assistance bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 19, line 12, insert the following:

"Sec. 16. Chapter 3 of part III of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 659. LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO PORTUGAL.—(A) The Congress declares that it is the policy of the United States that no military or economic assistance furnished by the United States, nor any items of equipment sold by or exported from the United States, shall be used to maintain the present status of the African territories of Portugal.

"(B) (1) The President of the United States shall, as soon as practicable following the date of the enactment of this section, make a determination and report to Congress with respect to the use by Portugal in support of its military activities in its African territories of—

"(a) assistance furnished under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, after the date of the enactment of this section;

"(b) defense articles or services furnished after such date under the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended;

"(c) agricultural commodities or local currencies furnished after such date under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1964, as amended, or any other Act; or

"(d) items for which validated export licenses are granted after such date for export to Portugal or its territories."

"(2) The President shall include a report similar to that specified in the previous subsection in each year at the time of submitting the budget request for foreign assistance. Such report shall also specify the steps being taken to implement the policy contained in this section.

"(C) All assistance, sales, and licenses referred to in the preceding paragraph shall be suspended upon the submission to Congress of a report by the President containing his determination that any such assistance, or item so furnished or exported, after such date, has been used in support of Portugal's military activities in its African territories. Such suspension shall continue until such time as the President submits a report to Congress containing his determination that appropriate corrective action has been taken by the Government of Portugal. The authority contained in section 614 of this Act shall not apply to programs terminated by reason of this section."

On page 25, line 21, change "Sec. 16." to "Sec. 17."

On page 28 line 5, change "Sec. 17." to "Sec. 18."

On page 28, line 10, change "Sec. 18." to "Sec. 19."

On page 28, line 20, change "Sec. 19." to "Sec. 20."

On page 29, line 4, change "Sec. 20." to "Sec. 21."

On page 29, line 10, change "Sec. 21." to "Sec. 22."

On page 30, line 4, change "Sec. 22." to "Sec. 23."

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no time be charged on the Tunney amendment today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO PAYMENT OF INTEREST ON TIME AND SAVINGS DEPOSITS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 160.

The senate proceeded to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 160, to provide for an extension of certain laws relating to the payment of interest on time and savings deposits, and for other purposes, which was read first by title and the second time at length.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be permitted the privilege of the floor during the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 160 and House Joint Resolution 719: Carl A. S. Coan, Tom Brooks, Mike Simpson, Jerry Buckley, and Kenneth McLean.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, this resolution would provide a congressional instruction to the Federal Reserve Board, the FDIC, and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to set some ceiling on the interest rates paid on the so-called "wild-card" CD's—4-year certificates of deposit of less than \$100,000 in amount. Since July, these CD's have been exempt from interest rate ceilings by regulation, so that savings institutions and banks can use these vehicles to compete with other money market instruments for funds during tight money periods. The thrift institutions have a difficult time, however, paying top interest rates on deposits like this, because their asset portfolio is heavily in long-term mortgages. Hence they

THE WASHINGTON POST

DATE 3 Oct 73 PAGE 1

Smallest Aid Bill Is Voted by Senate

By Spencer Rich
Washington Post Staff Writer

A \$1.2 billion foreign economic aid bill, the smallest since worldwide aid began a quarter century ago, passed the Senate on a 54 to 42 roll-call vote yesterday, after critics slashed \$250 million from the measure and failed by only a single vote to cut out another \$134 million.

The authorization bill was piloted to final approval by Sen. Hubert H. Humphrey (D-Minn.), who said the aid program is still urgently needed to help economic development in the world's poorest countries, some with gross national products below \$100 a year per person.

However, the program was sharply criticized by Sens. J. W. Fulbright (D-Ark.), Frank Church (D-Idaho), Harry Flood Byrd Jr. (Ind.-Va.) and others as providing excessive outlays

at a time when the United States is under the gravest economic pressure.

Fulbright also repeated his criticism of bilateral (country-to-country) aid, calling it a cold war relic in which the United States seeks to shore up friendly governments and "buy" their cooperation against Russia. Byrd said that while "official" aid funds seem relatively small, actual aid through related programs like special "soft loan" credit banks (Inter-American, Asian Development) and soft-currency farm sales totals about \$18 billion a year.

Before passing the bill, the Senate on a voice vote added an amendment by Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.) declaring it to be the sense of Congress

See AID, A19, Col. 1

AID, From A1

that economic or military aid to Chile be forbidden until the new military regime ceases what Kennedy called persecution of political prisoners and refugees, and complies with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Although little economic aid is currently programmed for Chile, some arms aid is expected to continue, according to an administration "position paper" opposing the Kennedy amendment.

Fulbright and Church led the assault on the bill yesterday, offering amendments to make deep cuts in the \$1.2-billion authorization total recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee. A Church proposal cutting it \$134 million to about \$1.1 billion was beaten, 47 to 46. Both Maryland senators opposed this cut, both Virginia senators backed it. A Fulbright move to cut the figure to \$1 billion also was defeated, 64 to 31.

However, the Senate on a 68 to 23 vote accepted a Church amendment wiping out the existing "reflow" authority of the Agency for International Development to use for its programs \$251 million in loan repayments by countries given money in previous years, in addition to the \$1.2 billion in new authority in the bill. J. Glenn Beall Jr. (R-Md.) was the only Maryland or Virginia senator opposing this amendment.

In other significant floor amendments, the Senate softened a provision cutting off

funds for foreign affairs' agencies if they fail to provide Congress with desired information in 35 days; the provision will apply only to information about the aid program.

Also softened, on the insistence of Appropriations Committee Chairman John L. McClellan (D-Ark.), was a provision barring all U.S. funds for training police in foreign countries. Designed to reduce aid for suppression of popular movements, this was changed to allow technical aid to other police forces on narcotics, sky-jacking and terrorism.

The bill cuts off all funds for Indochina combat, bars the United States from financing third-country mercenary troops in Indochinese nations and restructures the foreign aid program. It includes \$376 million for economic aid to South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

The White House asked \$1.6 billion for economic aid (including \$632 million for South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia) and \$1.2 billion for foreign military aid—a total of over \$2.8 billion.

The House passed a single authorization bill carrying \$2.7 billion for the overall programs, of which \$1.6 billion was for economic aid. (It also allowed the \$251 million in "reflows.") The Senate passed a separate \$770 million military aid authorization and now has allowed \$1.218 billion for the economic portion without any "reflows." The bills must go to conference to compromise the differences.

December 22, 1973

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 23943

Little Cigar Act

Amends the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (15 USC 1331-1340) as amended by the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969 by expanding the prohibition on advertising media to include "little cigars", defines the term "little cigar" to mean any role of tobacco wrapped in leaf tobacco or any substance containing tobacco (other than cigarettes) and weighing not more than 3 pounds per 1,000 units; and provides that it shall be unlawful to advertise little cigars on any medium of electronic communication subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission. S. 1165, Public Law 93-109, approved September 21, 1973. (VV)

National Institute of Health Care Delivery Act

Amends the Public Health Service Act to establish a National Institute of Health Care Delivery as a separate agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out an accelerated multidisciplinary research and development effort to improve the organization and delivery of health care in the nation; authorizes up to eight regional centers and two National Special Emphasis Centers, a Health Care Technology Center, and a Health Care Management Center; authorizes, for both the Institute and the Centers, \$115 million, \$130 million, and \$145 million for fiscal years 1974, 1975, and 1976 respectively; establishes a 21 member National Advisory Council on Health Care Delivery to advise the Institute on the development, priorities, and execution of its programs, and contains other provisions. S. 723. P/S May 15, 1973. (VV)

National Research Service Awards and Protection of Human Subjects Act

In title I, the National Research Service Award Act, consolidates the existing research training and fellowship programs into a single National Research Service Awards authority which would be the major element in the training programs of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Institute of Mental Health and would increase their capability of maintaining a superior national program of research, and provides a revised procedure whereby awards would be provided through the Office of the Director of NIH by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in consultation with the Directors of NIH and the National Institute for Mental Health;

Establishes, in title II, the Protection of Human Subjects Act, a National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects of Biomedical and Behavioral Research within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be composed of 11 members appointed by the President for 4 year terms, with not more than five members to have been engaged in biomedical or behavioral research involving human beings; provides that the Commission is first to undertake a comprehensive investigation and study to identify the basic ethical principles and develop guidelines which should underlie the conduct of biomedical and behavioral research involving human subjects; and second, to develop and implement policies and regulations to assure that research is carried out in accordance with the ethical principles they have identified, develop procedures for certification of Institutional Review Boards and also develop procedures for and make recommendations to the Congress in the areas of sanctions, compensation for injuries or death, and appropriate mechanisms to extend the scope of the Commission's jurisdiction;

Provides protection for individuals and institutions in matters of religious beliefs or moral convictions; prohibits research and experimentation on human fetuses until such time after certification of Institutional

Review Boards has been established and the Commission develops policies with regard to the conduct of research on the living fetus or infants;

Contains interim provisions denoting that, until the certification of Boards has been established, it is the responsibility of each institution engaged in such research to determine that the rights and welfare of the subjects involved are fully protected, that the risks are outweighed by the potential benefits to the subject or the importance of the knowledge to be gained, and that informed consent is to be obtained by adequate methods in all but exceptional cases as specified in this act;

Calls for the Commission, in title III, the Special Study of Biomedical Research Act, to make a comprehensive investigation and study of the ethical, social, and legal implications of advances in biomedical research and technology, with a report to be sent to the President and the Congress at least every 2 years together with recommendations for needed legislation or appropriate action by public or private organizations or individuals;

And contains other provisions. H.R. 7724. P/H May 31, 1973; P/S amended September 11, 1973; Senate requested conference September 11, 1973. (382)

Research in Aging Act

Amends title IV of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) of a National Institute on Aging (NIA) in the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for the conduct and support of biomedical, social, and behavioral research and training related to the aging process and the diseases and other special problems and needs of the aged, as authorized under section 301 of the Public Health Service Act and presently focused in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; provides that the Director of NIH shall assign functions to NIA or another institute when the activities overlap; directs the Secretary of HEW to:

(1) conduct scientific studies, through the Institute, for the purpose of measuring the impact on the biological, medical, and psychological aspects of aging, of all programs conducted or assisted by HEW to meet the needs of the aging in order to obtain data for assessment of the programs by the Institute;

(2) carry out public information and education programs to disseminate information developed by the Institute which may aid in dealing with, and understanding, the problems associated with aging; and

(3) prepare a comprehensive aging research plan within 1 year after enactment for presentation to the Congress and the President, along with a statement of the staffing and funding requirements necessary to implement the plan; and contains other provisions.

NOTE.—(H.R. 14424 [92d-2d], a similar measure, was pocket vetoed by President Nixon on October 30, 1972.) S. 775. P/S July 9, 1973. (VV)

School lunch and child nutrition programs

Amends section 6 of the National School Lunch Act which authorizes expenditures for commodities to provide a means to enable the Department of Agriculture, to meet school lunch and breakfast program needs for this fiscal year only, to make an estimate as of March 15 of the amount of commodities which the Department will deliver to schools; requires the Secretary (if this estimate is less than 90 percent of the value of the amount the Department originally planned to deliver to schools) to pay the States, no later than April 15, a cash amount equal to the difference between the initial estimate and the amount to be delivered this fiscal year as determined by the March 15 estimate,

and to distribute the money to the States according to their ratio of meals served under the school lunch and breakfast program; directs the Secretary to use section 32 funds and funds from section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 for the purposes of this act to request, if necessary, a supplemental appropriation; waives the matching requirements for the funds distributed under this act; and contains other provisions. H.R. 4278. Public Law 93-13, approved March 30, 1973. (VV)

Increases the present 8 cent Federal cash reimbursement for the school lunch program to 10 cents per lunch and sets the school breakfast program reimbursement at 8 cents; provides for an automatic adjustment in Federal reimbursement rates for both the school lunch and school breakfast program for January 1, 1974, and semi-annually thereafter, to reflect changes in the cost of operating such programs; makes permanent the requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture make cash payments to the States of any funds programmed for the purchase of commodities but not expended for that purpose; extends the authorization for the Special Supplemental Food program to June 30, 1975, and increases the authorization for fiscal year 1975 to \$40 million; makes agencies of Indian tribes eligible to administer the Special Supplemental Food Program; requires that the Special Milk Program be available to any school or non-profit child care institution that requests it and requires that children who qualify for free lunches shall also be eligible for free milk; increases the membership of the National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition from 13 to 15 members by adding an urban and rural school lunch program supervisor; changes the method of apportioning funds for free and reduced-price lunches and makes eligible for reduced price lunches those students whose parents' income is 75 percent, instead of 60 percent as presently provided, above the income poverty guideline prescribed to receive free lunches; and contains other provisions. H.R. 9639. Public Law 93-150, approved November 7, 1973. (403)

Sudden Infant Death Syndrome Act

Provides financial assistance to identify the causes and preventive measures needed to eliminate Sudden Infant Death Syndrome and provides information and counseling services to families affected by Sudden Infant Death Syndrome and to personnel who come in contact with the victims or their families. S. 1745. P/S December 11, 1973. (VV)

INDIANS

American Indian Policy Review Commission

Provides for a Congressional Commission of bipartisan composition from both the Senate and House of Representatives and five members from the Indian community to be selected by the Commission; charges the Commission with reviewing all of the treaties, statutes, judicial decisions, and executive orders, as well as the Constitution itself, to determine the legal-historical basis for the unique relationship that Indian people maintain with the Federal Government in order to bring a fundamental reform of such relationship; provides the authority to conduct an in-depth management study of the Bureau of Indian Affairs; requires the Commission to submit its recommendations to the Congress; and authorizes \$2 million for the purposes of carrying out this Act. S.J. Res. 133. P/S December 5, 1973.

Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs

Establishes within the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior who will be responsible only for Indian Affairs, and amends the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (85 Stat. 688) to establish a thirteenth region for Alaska Na-

S-23944

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 22, 1973

tives who are not residents of Alaska. H.R. 620. P/H October 1, 1973; P/S amended December 14, 1973; House disagreed to Senate amendments December 19, 1973; Senate requested conference December 19, 1973. (VV)
Choctaw, Chickasaw, and Cherokee Nations

Grants the consent of the United States for the Choctaw Nation, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Cherokee Nation to sue each other and other persons or entities to quiet title to certain portions of the bed of the Arkansas River in eastern Oklahoma. H.R. 5089. Public Law 93-195, approved December 20, 1973. (VV)

Glen Canyon National Recreation Area Concession Operations

Directs that the annual franchise fee received by the Secretary of the Interior from the concessioner in connection with the Rainbow Bridge floating concession operation in Glen Canyon National Recreation Area be placed in a separate fund of the Treasury, and authorizes the Secretary to transfer annually such fees from the fund to the Navajo Tribe of Indians, in consideration of the tribe's continued agreement to the use of former Navajo Indian Reservation lands for the purpose of anchoring the Rainbow Bridge floating concession facility. S. 1384. P/S May 23, 1973 (VV)

Indian Claims Commission

Authorizes not to exceed \$1.2 million for the expenses of the Indian Claims Commission for fiscal year 1974, and an additional \$900 million for the expense assistance revolving loan fund. S. 721. Public Law 93-37, approved May 24, 1973. (VV)

Indian Financing Act

Provides to Indian organizations and individual Indians capital in the form of loans and grants that is needed to promote their economic development; authorizes a \$50 million increase for the Revolving Loan Fund; provides a Loan Guarantee and Insurance Program which could generate as much as \$200 million in new private capital; authorizes an Interest Subsidy Program, and provides an Indian Business Development Grant Program. S. 1341. P/S July 28, 1973. (VV)

Indian Judgment Distribution Act

Provides that if neither House of Congress, within 60 calendar days (excluding adjournments of more than 3 days) from the date of submission of a recommended plan by the Secretary of the Interior regarding the distribution of funds awarded to Indian Tribal groups by the Court of Claims, passes a committee resolution disapproving such plan and thus requires authorizing legislation, the plan will become effective and the distribution of such funds made upon the expiration of the 60 day period or earlier if waived by committee resolutions by both the House and the Senate Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs, thereby relieving the Committees of the necessity of having to legislate on all judgment awards except for the most complicated. S. 1016. Public Law 93-184, approved October 19, 1973. (VV)

Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Administration—abolishment

Abolishes the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration created during the 81st Congress to consider the problems peculiar to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes and oversee the expenditure of funds appropriated for the development of their reservations, construction, of facilities, and other needed improvements, work which was principally completed in 1964. S. 267. P/S February 5, 1973. (VV)

Klamath Indian tribal land acquisition

Directs the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire by condemnation the remainder of the Klamath Indian Forest lands, for inclusion in the Winema National Forest,

which the Klamath Tribe has directed the United States National Bank of Portland, a private trustee, to sell by the terms of its trust agreement and authorizes for this purpose an amount not to exceed \$70 million. H.R. 3867. Public Law 93-102, approved August 16, 1973. (VV)

Knife River Indian Village National Historic Site

Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire a cluster of 5 archeological sites located near the Knife and Missouri Rivers together with additional lands as may be necessary and to administer the area as the Knife River Indian Villages National Historical Site. S. 1408. P/S November 30, 1973. (VV)

Menominee Restoration Act

Reinstates the act terminating supervision over the affairs of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin; makes available to the tribe the Federal services lost through termination; and provides for the reestablishment of tribal self-government. H.R. 10717. Public Law 93-100, approved 1973. (VV)

National Trail Act amendment

Provides for the addition of an Indian Nations Trail to the trails to be studied for possible inclusion in the national scenic trails system. S. 1976. P/S November 30, 1973. (VV)

Publication of material relating to the constitutional rights of Indians

Amends, for technical reasons, section 701(c) of title VII of Public Law 90-284 to authorize the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the Secretary of the Interior (1) to annually revise and republish the documents entitled "Indian Affairs, Laws and Treaties," (2) to revise and republish the treatise entitled "Federal Indian Laws," and (3) to have prepared and printed as a government publication an accurate compilation of the official opinions of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior relating to Indian affairs. S. 609. P/S June 27, 1973. (VV)

INTERNATIONAL

Atlantic Union delegation

Authorizes the creation of a delegation of 18 eminent citizens (8 each to be appointed by the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the President) to meet with similar unofficial delegations "from such North Atlantic Treaty parliamentary democracies as desire to join in the enterprise" in order to explore the possibility of agreement on a "declaration that the goal of their peoples is to transform their present relationship into a more effective unity based on Federal principles," and empowers the convention to invite other parliamentary democracies to participate in the process, which would also explore the possibilities for a timetable and a commission to move toward the goal by stages. S.J. Res. 200. P/S March 26, 1973. (VV)

Board for International Broadcasting Act

Authorizes \$50,209,000 for fiscal year 1974 for the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and creates a new Board for International Broadcasting charged with making grants to the radios and overseeing their operations, which shall take over the role presently performed by the State Department of administering grants to the radios. S. 1914. Public Law 93-129, approved October 19, 1973. (389)

Department of State Authorization Act

Authorizes a total of \$682,036,000, including \$4.5 million for the U.S. share of expenses of the International Commission on Control and Supervision in Vietnam; prohibits the use of funds on or after August 15, 1973, for further involvement of U.S. forces in hostilities in North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia or direct or indirect aid to North Vietnam unless specifically authorized hereafter by Congress; establishes a new Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs

in the Department of State to be headed by an additional Assistant Secretary; requires that military base agreements with foreign countries be submitted to the Congress where they can be approved either by passage of a concurrent resolution by both the House and the Senate or by the Senate giving its advice and consent to the agreement; requires that funds be cut off for foreign affairs agencies which do not comply within 35 days with requests for information by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations or the House Committee for Foreign Affairs, and amends section 634(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act containing similar provisions concerning access to information by the Congress and the General Accounting Office, to eliminate the President's privilege of waiving its provisions except with regard to Presidential communications; prohibits the use of funds appropriated pursuant to the act to be used for publicity or propaganda to attempt to influence the outcome of legislation pending before Congress or the outcome of a political election; requires by law the listing by rank order of Foreign Service personnel selected for promotion; states the sense of Congress that the United States and Russia seek agreement on specific mutual reductions in military expenditures; and contains other provisions. H.R. 7645. Public Law 93-126, approved October 18, 1973. (191)
Diplomatic relations between Sweden and the United States

Expresses the sense of the Senate that "the United States Government and Sweden should restore their normal friendly relations, and confirm this return to normalcy by appointing and dispatching ambassadors to their respective capitals on an immediate basis." S. Res. 149. Senate adopted October 4, 1973. (VV)

Environmental modification as a weapon of war

Expresses as a sense of the Senate that the United States Government should seek the agreement of other governments, including all permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations, to a proposed treaty for the complete cessation of any research experimentation or use of any environmental or geophysical modification activity as a weapon of war, including weather, climate, earthquake, and ocean modification activity. S. Res. 71. Senate adopted July 11, 1973. (266)

Euratom Cooperation Act of 1958 amendment

Amends section 5 of the EURATOM Cooperation Act of 1958, as amended, by increasing the amount, from 215,000 kilograms to 583,000 kilograms, of contained uranium 235 which the United States Atomic Energy Commission is authorized to transfer to the European Atomic Energy Community under the Agreements for Cooperation between the United States and EURATOM. S. 1993. Public Law 93-48, approved August 14, 1973. (VV)

Foreign Assistance Act

Authorizes appropriations for economic assistance to foreign countries comprised of grants and loans of \$1,218,200,000 divided among five development assistance categories, Food and Nutrition, Population Planning and Health, Education and Human Resources Development, Selected Development Programs, and Selected Countries and Organizations, instead of, as formerly, providing funds for development loans, technical cooperation and development grants, and the Alliance for Progress; provides for greater transferability of funds among the five categories than is now permitted among present funding categories, whereby the President may transfer not to exceed 15 percent of the funds under one category to another in an amount which does not increase the funds in the other category by more than 25 per-